THE CLIENT PRINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

P. C. SANDS

The
William Edward Reis
Library



Allegheny College

WITHDRAWN

Cambridge Historical Essays. No. xvi.

THE CLIENT PRINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER.
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET.



Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.
Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS.
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

[*All Rights reserved*]

937
Sa5

THE CLIENT PRINCES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE UNDER THE REPUBLIC

by

P. C. SANDS, M.A.,

Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge

THE THIRLWALL PRIZE, 1906

CAMBRIDGE:
at the University Press
1908



Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE

THE main part of this essay deals with the acts and functions which constituted the clientship of the kings who came under the influence of the Roman Republic. The vagueness of this clientship made it necessary to prefix a discussion as to the technical position which the kings occupied by treaty, as friends or allies. A bare outline of the clientship of the more important kings of Africa and Asia is supplied by the collection of quotations in the larger of the two Appendices.

While this essay was in course of preparation for the press, there appeared in the Classical Quarterly (July, 1907) a thesis by Miss L. E. Matthaei, which discussed the classification of the Roman allies in general, and since some of her conclusions were arrived at independently in Part I of this essay, it may be as well to mention in what respects the two dissertations coincide. The main conclusions common to both, but reached by different methods, are (1) that the 'socii et amici' of Rome were identical with the 'amici,' and

10728

were not a class intermediate between the 'socii' and the 'amici,' as Mommsen supposed; (2) that the aid rendered by these 'socii et amici' was quite voluntary.

For much information on tribute, on the gifts sent to the kings, and on the position of the kings regarded as outside the 'imperium Romanum,' besides various other details, this book is indebted to a treatise by Oscar Bohn (Haack, Berlin, 1876), which deals with the period of the Empire, but also contains allusions to the Republican period. On the question of coinage,—too vague and wide to be treated successfully in an essay of these proportions,—the scanty notices of Bohn, supplemented by Mommsen's *Münzwesen*, have had to suffice. A dissertation by Virgil Ferrenbach (Kayser, Strassburg, 1895) supplied many references in Part I, but the large majority of the quotations throughout the book were collected in a complete but hasty survey of the principal ancient authorities. The modern historians mainly consulted for the historical materials involved were Niese, Holm, and Mommsen. On the position of the dependent states of Rome I have consulted Mommsen's *Staatsrecht,* the Dictionary of Daremberg and Saglio, Pauly's Encyclopaedia, and Bruns' *Fontes Iuris Romani.* Most of their information however applies only to republican states and to municipalities, and analogies drawn from these to the position of the kings do not always hold good. Other works consulted are mentioned in the notes.

I have to thank Mr L. Whibley of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Mr T. R. Glover of St John's College for many valuable criticisms and corrections. The rearrangement of my materials was carried out to a great extent in accordance with their suggestions. To Mr Glover I am also indebted for the reading of the proof-sheets, and for a large measure of encouragement bestowed at those times when the need of it was chiefly felt. The guidance and assistance of Professor J. S. Reid were placed at my disposal from the first, and he has informed me on points too numerous to be always acknowledged in the notes. For all his kindly attention I cannot thank him sufficiently.

P. C. S.

LONDON,
November, 1908.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGES

GROWTH OF THE PROTECTORATE 1–9

PART I

THE KINGS AS FRIENDS OR ALLIES 10–48

Friendship and alliance, 10. Temporary alliances, 11. Agreements with Republics, 12. Evidence from official sources, 12. Decrees quoted by Josephus, 14. Terminology of various authorities, 15. Formulae Amicorum, Sociorum, 40. Summary, 42.

PART II

ACTS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CLIENTSHIP . . 49–139

i. Terms of extant 'Foedera' 49

ii. Recognition of the Client as king . . . 57

Methods of 'Recognition,' 57. Causes of its necessity; nature of the Mediterranean kingships, 61. Duration of the Roman foedus, 65. Nature of the Roman kingship, 67. Circumstances attending 'Recognition,' 71. Gifts, 75. Effects of 'Recognition,' 76. Settlement of the succession by Rome, 77. Roman arbitration, 78. Control over the king, 81. Refusal of 'Recognition' and annexation, 83.

PAGES

iii. Foreign policy of the Client 88

Roman friendship paramount, 88. Rome's consent required for war, 95. Roman arbitration between Clients, 95. Senate's policy in Asia, 98. Commissions of inspection, 100. Services of the kings in war, 103. Voluntary nature of service, 107. Duty of Rome in return, 110. Clients rewarded with territory, 112.

iv. Internal affairs of the Client 114

Kingdoms lay outside the Roman 'imperium,' 114. King's ownership of his territory, 117. His power absolute, 118. Power over Roman residents, 119. Rights of coinage, 120. Control of his army, 122. Right of bequest, 122. Absence from his kingdom, 124. Occasions of Roman intervention, 125.

v. Evocatio 125

vi. Tribute 127

Free states tax-free, 127. Individuals tax-free as friends of Rome, 127. Tribute peculiar to conquered and provincial soil, 128. No instances of tributary kings under the Republic, 130. Judaea not tributary when ruled by kings, 134. Exactions of tribute by Antony irregular, 134. Irregular contributions by Clients, 135. Bribes, 137. Crowns as presents, 138.

Personal Relations of the Kings . . . 139–142

Private friendships, 139. Privileges, 140. Treatment when conquered, 141. Kings as Roman citizens, 142.

Bequest of Kingdoms and Annexation . . 143–151

Senate's abstention from annexation, 143. Occasions of annexation; bequests of Pergamum, Egypt, Bithynia, and Cyrene, 145. Their genuineness, 146. Treatment of annexed territory, 147. The term 'freedom' applied to the people of the annexed country, 149.

PAGES

ATTITUDE OF ROME AND HER CLIENTS TO ONE ANOTHER 151–154

THE ROMAN PROTECTORATE AND ROMAN INTERESTS . 154–162

Rome self-interested in dealing with attacks upon her Clients, 154; also in neglecting the welfare of her Clients' subjects, 157. Protected chiefs in British India; British intervention against rebellion and oppression, 159. Differences between the Roman and British Protectorates, 160.

APPENDIX A

INTERCOURSE OF THE KINGS WITH ROME . . . 163–228

i. Sicily: Hiero 163
ii. Egypt with Cyprus and Cyrene: the Ptolemies 165
iii. Numidia: Masinissa, etc. 174
iv. Mauretania: Bocchus, etc. 180
v. Macedonia: Philip V, Perseus . . . 182
vi. Pergamum: the Attalids, Eumenes II . . 184
vii. Syria: Antiochus III, Seleucus IV, etc. . 190
viii. Bithynia: Prusias I, etc. 196
ix. Cappadocia: Ariarathes IV, etc. . . . 200
x. Pontus: Mithridates V and VI . . . 207
xi. Bosporus: Pharnaces, etc. 209
xii. Galatia: the tetrarchs, Deiotarus, Amyntas . 211
xiii. Commagene: Antiochus 216
xiv. Armenia: Tigranes, Artavasdes . . . 218
xv. Parthia 221
xvi. Judaea: Hyrcanus, Herod 222

APPENDIX B

EVIDENCE OF BRIBERY BY THE KINGS . . . 229–230

TABLE OF REFERENCES TO DIODORUS . . . 231

INDEX 233

CORRIGENDA

Pages 2 (n. 1), 49 (n. 2), *for* XXI. *read* XXIII.
Page 28 (n. 3), *for* XXXII. 16 *read* XXXII. 17.
Page 152 (n. 2), *for* XXII. *read* XXXII.

INTRODUCTION

§ **1.** A client in Roman civic life could not do certain things in his own name and by his own right. He required a patron to act for him and represent him with full authority. He owed this patron certain duties, but on the other hand the patron owed him protection. By client-princes therefore may be understood those rulers, who in one or more directions were limited in their power of initiative, and had either to receive Rome's sanction for their actions or let Rome act for them; who owed Rome certain services, but in return received her protection. The incompleteness of this clientship and protectorate will be pointed out from time to time later.

Growth of the Protectorate.

§ **2.** The first king of importance who became in any measure Rome's client was Hiero of Syracuse in 263 B.C.[1], the reason being twofold. In the first place when he left the side of Carthage to join the stronger power of Rome, he needed thereby the latter's protection against his late ally. In the second place he was

Hiero of Syracuse, 263 B.C.

[1] Appendix A, I.

thrown upon that protection by his unconstitutional position in Syracuse. "*Seeing the Syracusans indignant,*" says Diodorus[1], "at the ill success of Carthage and of himself, he sent to the consuls to treat for peace," with which we may compare the statement of Polybius[2] that "king Hiero put himself under the protection of the Romans, and while he constantly administered to their necessities ruled over the Syracusans without anxiety." When Carthage was beaten and Rome had little to fear from Hiero, he found it politic to ingratiate himself still further with the victor.

Numidia (Masinissa), 206 B.C.

§ 3. The situation of Masinissa[3] whose clientship commenced in 206 B.C. was very similar, but his need of protection was the greater because Rome was further away, and Carthage, which had already helped to expel him from his kingdom, lay upon his borders. With the second defeat of Carthage in 202 B.C., he became entirely dependent upon Rome's generosity. From Rome he received back his kingdom largely extended and to no other power could he look for its safety and increase. It was moreover only as Rome's client that he increased it at the expense of Carthage and the neighbouring tribes. The final downfall of Carthage in 146 B.C. imposed on Numidia for good the overlordship of the Romans, who now possessed territory in Africa itself.

Asia.

§ 4. In Asia, where Rome's next struggles befell, more clientships were instituted under similar conditions. The smaller kingdoms of Asia, situated between the two aggressive powers of Macedonia and

[1] XXI. 6. [2] I. 16, 10. [3] Append. A, III.

Syria had no alternative but to assist the policy of Rome. Attalus I[1] cooperated with Rome for the first time against Philip of Macedon in 211 B.C. and later in the second Macedonian war in 201 B.C. but as yet, with the exception that the peace terms were dictated in Rome, whither Attalus had to send representatives, he cooperated on an equal footing. While Antiochus III was still unchecked, and her ability to cope with him uncertain, Rome could not establish her authority over the kingdoms upon his borders. Ariarathes of Cappadocia and Prusias of Bithynia were inclined to seek the friendship of whichever proved the stronger. It is not therefore till the conquest of that king that we find Rome acting as protector and arbitrator on behalf of the kings of Pergamum, Bithynia and Cappadocia, and the princes of Galatia[2]. It is then that Eumenes goes to Rome in person to state his requests, accepts a gift of territory as Rome's *protégé*, and appeals to her arbitration against his neighbours; that the king of Cappadocia is compelled to pay a price for Rome's friendship; and that the Galatian princes submit to Eumenes at her command.

Kings of Pergamum, Bithynia, and Cappadocia, 190–188 B.C.

§ 5. All these smaller monarchs had much to gain from Rome's support. Antiochus III and Philip had little[3]. They were still too strong to be used as dependents nor could the motive of interest induce them to put themselves at her service, for they knew that the Power, through which they had lost so much, was anxious to see them weaker still. It is true that Philip helped Rome against Antiochus but not in the

[1] Append. A, VI. [2] *ib.* VI. VIII. IX. and XII. [3] *ib.* V. and VII.

same way as the smaller monarchs. He helped not as one whose interests were bound up with those of the Republic, but from motives of retaliation against Antiochus III, and then only where some immediate reward was held out to him. Nor did Rome consider him in her truces with the enemy[1]. Perseus[2], his successor, sought upon his accession to gain time for the accumulation of his resources by a renewal of the friendship with Rome, but apart from this act he steadily resisted the senate's authority until his fall. Antiochus III's successor, Seleucus IV[3], continued to pay off the indemnity due from his father, but there is little in his relations with Rome indicative of clientship.

Syria (Antiochus IV), 175 B.C.

Upon his decease, however, Antiochus IV[4], his brother, by the very manner in which he obtained the kingdom, was compelled to secure the goodwill of the Roman senate. While Demetrius, the son of Seleucus, was in Rome as a hostage, Antiochus crossed from Greece and seized the Syrian throne by the aid of Rome's client, Eumenes (175 B.C.). The possibility of Demetrius appearing as a rival in Syria, and winning the support of many of his subjects rested in the discretion of the senate, and constantly exposed him to the interference and supervision of that body. The situation of his successors was similar owing to the frequent rise of rival claimants to the throne.

Pontus (Mithridates V), 150 B.C. *circ.*

§ 6. One other kingdom in Asia, that of Pontus[5], became to some slight extent dependent upon Rome, when Mithridates V sought her friendship and helped her against Carthage in 147 B.C. His son, Mithridates

[1] Append. A, v. 3. [2] *ib.* v. 4, 5. [3] *ib.* VII. 3.
[4] *ib.* VII. 4, 5. [5] *ib.* X.

Eupator, taking advantage of the situation of his kingdom, and the inactivity of the senate, practically maintained his independence, so that Velleius[1] cited him as "the last of the independent kings except those of Parthia."

§ 7. In Egypt the Ptolemies[2] until 204 B.C. enjoyed friendly intercourse with Rome on equal terms, and in that year the guardians of Ptolemy V seem to have renewed the friendship. Soon after came the arrangement between Philip and Antiochus III, to divide Egypt between them. Rome, again concerned to preserve a balance of power between the kings, declared war on Philip and tried to appease Antiochus by negotiation. The latter however meanwhile pressed the Egyptian regents so hard that they came to a secret understanding with him[3]. When Rome, after beating Philip, demanded the restoration of Coele-Syria to Ptolemy V, Antiochus was able to shew that Egypt had managed without Roman protection. The date of Egypt's clientship was therefore postponed, though there are certain traditions which disregard the above facts and aim at representing the authority of the senate as already established in Egypt[2]. The occasion upon which the Egyptian kings really became clients of Rome ("in fide populi Romani,"—Livy) was the intervention of the senate against Antiochus IV who had nearly reduced the kingdom to dependence upon himself, 168 B.C. Ptolemy VI had previously sent to renew 'the friendship,' and explain his attack upon Syria (171 B.C.), and on meeting with reverses at the

Egypt

(Ptolemy VI), 168 B.C.

[1] II. 40. [2] Append. A, II. [3] Holm, *Gr. H.* vol. IV. ch. XVII. n. 2.

hands of Antiochus, sent to Rome for help. The senate, after waiting for news of the victory of Pydna, intervened with such strong, almost arrogant diplomacy as to shew that she claimed henceforth to be arbitress of all quarrels of importance in the Mediterranean coasts.

§ 8. The protectorate established by the senate over the Asiatic kings was far more pronounced when the so-called province of Asia was acquired in 133 B.C. by the bequest of Attalus. The effect of this was largely counteracted by the inactivity of the senate. Still the presence of her magistrates in the immediate neighbourhood led to that closer subordination of the kings that we find in the last century of the Republic.

Judaea The Jewish high-priests[1] began about this time to send their often repeated requests for aid against Syria and renewals of friendship with the Republic, but at first Rome was not sufficiently interested in them to shew much activity on their behalf. Pompey was the first Roman general to approach them in person, in 63 B.C., but made them subject rather than client. Caesar after Pharsalia ameliorated the position of Hyrcanus,

(*Herod*), 41 B.C. but not until Herod was set up as king, and Judaea thus freed from the interference of the Syrian governor, were the relations of the Judaean ruler such as to put him upon the same footing as the other client-kings.

Mauretania (*Bocchus*), 105 B.C. § 9. Further clientships ensued from new wars in Africa and Asia. In 105 B.C. the Mauretanian Bocchus[2] found it necessary to assist Rome and profess himself her servant in order to escape the penalty for rendering aid to Jugurtha. It was made quite clear to him by

[1] Append. A, XVI. [2] *ib.* IV.

Marius's lieutenant, Sulla, that he would not be allowed to preserve neutrality. In 66 B.C. Tigranes[1], as a result of assisting Mithridates VI, succumbed to Rome and retained his kingdom on a similar condition. Also during the war with Mithridates, Commagene[2] was admitted to friendship and clientship (68 B.C.), while Parthia[3], though treated haughtily by Pompey, never became dependent under the Republic, owing to its situation.

Armenia (Tigranes), 66 B.C.

Commagene (Antiochus), 68 B.C.

§ 10. The institution of the Roman protectorate in the Mediterranean was thus accomplished by a gradual and indistinct process. Rome's power came to be felt without being definitely enunciated or formulated by treaty or ordinance. The influx of dignity and renown that rewarded on successive occasions the conquests of Carthage, Macedonia, and Syria, and the readiness with which she assumed that dignity, made it quite unnecessary for her to subdue smaller powers. The latter from hope of reward or fear of injury were as ready to acknowledge Rome's paramount position as she herself was to adopt it, and Rome content with this acknowledgment chose to express her sovereignty not in definite terms made with each particular country after the manner of modern protectorates, but in successive acts of protection or aggression to suit the moment, in every part of the Mediterranean. It is easily seen what an amount of freedom, whether to interfere or to abstain, this vague and undefined position left her; what an advantage it gave her for the pursuance of her own interests, what a laxity of obligation towards any

[1] Append. A, XIV. [2] *ib.* XIII. [3] *ib.* XV.

king or country that had sought her protection. For instance, the excuse of Pompey, which he made for the annexation of Syria, whose rulers had through several generations been recognised by Rome, disavows the existence of any protectorate at all[1]. She thus escaped the indignity of retreat from responsibilities which she could not meet, or from a position which she could not hold. Acts of protection came from her bounty, and she could proceed as far as she cared, or was able to, on each occasion[2].

§ 11. The want of terminology expressive of her power was not altogether accidental. Rome seems to have been careful not to offend her dependents by laying stress upon their subordination. It is only Greek and late Roman authorities who call the dependent kings 'subjects,' writing moreover of the late Republican period[3]. When Rome received a king's allegiance, she did so either by the formal act of

[1] Append. A, VII. 29.

[2] We may contrast the manifestoes of the British Viceroys to the client-chiefs in India, which, though applicable only to individual states, serve as precedents for other states in India, and lead to a common policy. These manifestoes and treaties pronounced in explicit terms certain definite obligations on both sides, however comprehensively expressed. Many of the obligations tacitly acknowledged by Rome's clients, and when it was convenient, by herself, e.g., the necessity of the Roman recognition, the client's obligation to assist in war, the duty of loyalty to the Protector, are formulated in writing in the British Indian agreements. (See Warner, *Protected Princes of India* (passim).)

[3] The kings are called ὑπήκοοι by Strabo (VI. 4, 2, p. 288), Plutarch (*Ant.* 61), Dio (XXXVII. 15, 1), and Josephus (*Ant.* XIV. 77). Diodorus (XXXII. 4, XXXIII. 21) and Josephus (*Ant.* XIV. 157) speak also of the ἡγεμονία of the Romans. Tacitus (*Hist.* II. 81, 1) also mentions Antiochus of Commagene as "inservientium regum ditissimus," and cf. Dio, XLI. 55.

recognising his claim to the title 'king,' or by granting a treaty of 'friendship' or 'friendship and alliance.' The necessity and significance of the recognition of the royal title will be discussed in a later section. At present the titles 'friend' and 'friend and ally' are the most important consideration, because they are practically the sole official indication of the footing upon which the kings were placed, and in whatever degree they became subservient to Rome, they continued to be called by the senate 'amici,' 'socii,' or 'socii atque amici.' The use of these titles varies greatly in the authorities, many of whom apply to the kings without distinction the single title 'friend' or the double title. Since in modern terminology there is a great distinction between the two, it is necessary to examine them the more closely.

PART I

THE KINGS AS 'FRIENDS' OR 'ALLIES.'

'Friendship' and 'Alliance.'

§ **12.** It need not to be pointed out that the existence of a friendly understanding or even of a definite treaty of friendship between two powers does not technically impose upon either of those powers an obligation to help the other. Before one can claim to receive from the other active help, the existing treaty must be converted into one of alliance, by which the two parties bind themselves to render mutual aid under certain specified conditions. These conditions may prescribe obligation for a definite term of years, or against a particular foe; on the other hand they may, by introducing no such limits, prescribe obligations to cooperate as ally on every occasion and for all time, so long as neither of the contracting parties break the agreement.

The essence of an alliance being this obligation to render aid, when Rome named kings 'reges socii' or 'socii atque amici' and granted them so-called alliances, were the terms 'socius' and 'societas' used in their correct and technical sense? Were these terms employed in virtue of an existing treaty which bound the

two parties to render mutual aid in war? We hope to shew that this was not so; that a king was styled 'socius' by Rome even where no treaty existed at all; that where a treaty existed, its terms stipulated no more than friendship, and made no provision for active alliance; that requests for aid were made to and answered by Rome in such terms as plainly indicate the absence of any definite conditions of alliance; that Rome only granted such requests when her own interests were involved, and moreover herself sometimes solicited help only in the name of goodwill or friendship; lastly, that a king who deemed it expedient to procure the Roman recognition of his sovereignty, if successful in his request, was greeted by Rome indifferently by one of three titles, those of 'rex,' 'amicus' and 'socius atque amicus,' and that the terms 'friendship,' 'alliance' and 'friendship and alliance' were interchangeable terms in the definition of his treaty. The conclusion to be drawn is that the loose use of these terms was due to the inequality of the powers who used them, as protector and client respectively. The protector used them as compliments in return for services which the client out of gratitude, fear, or hope of reward had already rendered, and to accustom the client to such voluntary service; the client desired the title 'ally of Rome' as a moral support against his neighbours, even though Rome rarely vouchsafed him active support. Practically the client's relation to Rome was simply one of friendship.

Temporary alliances.

The argument must not be confused by the rare instances of temporary alliances to which Rome con-

sented for a definite period against a particular foe[1]. When the latter came to terms, and the need for cooperation ceased, the alliance also ceased; both parties had fulfilled their engagements and each maintained the same footing as before. Neither can any longer be properly called the ally of the other. When therefore there has been such a temporary alliance between Rome and a foreign king, it will not make the later application of the terms 'socius' and 'societas,' in speaking of the king's footing, any the more justifiable either in his case or in that of his descendants. So that the value of the term 'socius' as a standing title of the client-king must be discussed independently of such temporary alliances.

Agreements with Republics.

Nor again must the footing of the kings be judged by evidence relating to the republics with which Rome came into contact. We know for instance that Polybius praises the skill of the Rhodians in having so long avoided an alliance with Rome, though for so many years united by friendship, and speaks soon after of the institution of the closer bond[2]. The distinction is here clearly drawn. So Cicero can class separately the tributaries, the friends and the allies of the Republic[3]. We shall see however that this distinction is not maintained by either Polybius or Cicero when they speak of the treaties and titles of the kings.

Evidence from Official Sources.

§ **13**. There are some passages which preserve almost the actual words of certain decrees and treaties. From these we see that Rome sometimes made a

[1] E.g. with Attalus in 211 B.C. *v.* Append. A, VI. 1, 2.
[2] XXX. 5, 6–8. [3] *Leg.* III. 41.

treaty of mere 'friendship' with a king, e.g. the treaty with Antiochus III (190 B.C.)[1]. Other evidence from original sources may be cited in support, though not actually giving the terms of the treaty on which the title 'friend' or 'friendship' is based. Thus Attalus II desired to renew "the existing goodwill" according to an inscription of Pergamum[2], and in the Monumentum Ancyranum the kings of the Parthians, of the Sarmatae, and of other remote tribes, are said by Augustus to have sought 'the friendship' of the Roman people[3].

We further find that Rome made treaties also of so-called 'friendship and alliance,' as, for instance, with Mithridates VI of Pontus (before 92 B.C.)[4], and with his son of the same name, king of Paphlagonia[5]. With reference to the firstnamed of these, we cannot infer from Appian that the treaty included stipulations about mutual aid. Appian simply represents the envoy of Mithridates as quoting from the treaty the phrase *φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος*, and as appealing to Rome on the strength of this title[6].

In official language we also find the title 'friend and ally' applied to certain kings, viz. to Antiochus IV[7], and to one of the Ptolemies of Egypt at the beginning

[1] Polyb. XXI. 45, 1–27. Polybius used a copy of the actual treaty. Cf. also the treaty with Viriathus which seems to be reported from an original source by Appian's authority (App. *Iber.* 139).

[2] Fränkel, *Inschr. von Pergamon*, No. 224, l. 17 ff.

[3] Mon. Anc. 29, 31, 32. [4] App. *Mith.* 12.

[5] *C.I.L.* VI. Pt. 4, 30922.

[6] App. *l.c.* *παρακαλεῖ Μιθριδάτης φίλος ὢν ὑμῖν καὶ σύμμαχος φίλους ὄντας ὑμᾶς καὶ συμμάχους (ὧδε γὰρ αἱ συνθῆκαι λέγουσιν), ἐπικουρεῖν ἠμῖν ἀδικουμένοις.*

[7] Polyb. XXXIII. 18, 12 (16, 12).

of the first century B.C.[1] The former of these certainly had no treaty containing a definite stipulation about mutual aid, for he renewed "his father's treaty of friendship[2]," and is spoken of elsewhere only as 'friend[3],' and though the senate recognised his son Balas and decreed help, they did not aid him themselves but merely granted permission to their friends and allies to befriend him[4].

Thus neither the treaty of 'friendship and alliance' nor the title 'friend and ally' means necessarily that the king was on a footing of close alliance implying mutual obligation.

(Josephus quotes many decrees of the Roman senate and its representatives which include references to treaties of 'friendship and alliance' with the Jews[5]. In one of these treaties we actually find a stipulation for the rendering of mutual assistance[6]. The Jewish people however, being peculiarly constituted, always received a peculiar treatment from the Romans, nor again were its high-priests and ethnarchs, as we have pointed out, in the same category with their responsible rulers of Asiatic kingdoms, so that until the time of Herod they hardly fall within the scope of this enquiry[7]. That even in their case, in spite of the stipulation above mentioned, the alliance was purely nominal, is shewn by the following facts: to one of their many appeals for assistance,—appeals always made in vain,—the reply was given that the senate would look into their

[1] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 250. *v.* also Append. A, II. 17 (note).
[2] Liv. XLII. 6, 8, 10. [3] App. *Mac.* 11. [4] Polyb. *l.c.*
[5] Jos. *Ant.* XII. 418; XIII. 259; XIV. 194, 197, 214, 249.
[6] *v.* n. 5, XII. 418. [7] *v.* also Append. A, XVI. (Hyrc.).

complaints when it had leisure from its own private affairs[1]; in one of the early treaties the senate renewed the '*friendship*' and accepted a shield as a symbol of '*alliance*[2]'; while Antony in a decree speaks of the Jews simply as an '*ἔθνος φίλον*[3]'.)

Use of the terms in Polybius.

§ **14**. Among the historians who write of the third and second centuries B.C. Polybius is the most reliable in his terminology, as being contemporary with many of the events which he relates, and careful in his historical method. The treaties with Hiero and Antiochus III he shews to have been treaties of friendship, in the latter case quoting the actual stipulation concerning *φιλία*[4]. With Ptolemy VI Philometor in 171 B.C. he says there was a renewal of '*τὰ φιλάνθρωπα*[4],' and repeats the phrase, but in speaking of a time within fifteen years later he asserts that the Roman senate resolved to break off the 'alliance[5].' This might be explained by a fresh treaty having been made in the meantime, but the inconsistency appears also in his account of Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia and his son, Ariarathes V, the former of whom was made '*φίλος*,' while the latter in 163 B.C. renewed 'the friendship and alliance.' Yet Ariarathes V "felt safe, because he had secured the Roman *goodwill*[6]." To Demetrius I of Syria it was promised by the senate that "he would obtain *τὰ φιλάνθρωπα* if sufficiently deserving" (160 B.C.)[7]. With Attalus II there was "a renewal of friendship and hospitality" (152 B.C.)[8], which is con-

[1] Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 259. [2] *ib.* XIV. 146–148. [3] *ib.* XIV. 320.
[4] Append. A, I. 1; VII. 1; II. 3.
[5] Polyb. XXXII. 1 (XXXI. 20). [6] Append. A, IX. 10. [7] *ib.* VII. 17.
[8] Polyb. XXXIII. 18, 2.

sistent with the account of his predecessors. For Attalus I was "glad because the Romans were mindful of their *former* alliance," shewing that that alliance was only regarded as temporary, while Eumenes I, addressing the senate in 189 B.C. speaks of the Roman "friendship and goodwill," and "the inclination" of his father which he himself has followed. And the senate judged him, says Polybius, their "first and greatest friend" (166 B.C.)[1]. Edeco, chief of the Edetani, was likewise declared 'friend,' and accordingly Scipio contracted 'friendship' with him (208 B.C.)[2]. Of Masinissa Polybius says simply that he "kept faith" with Rome[3].

One other passage must be quoted, in which the Romans are asserted to have renounced their 'friendship and alliance' with Prusias II (154 B.C.)[4], though in a passage which speaks of Prusias I's dealings with Rome, it is not said that any definite alliance was made[5], nor is Prusias II stated to have formed such a connexion. We also learn that the young Alexander Balas reminded the senate of "the *friendship and alliance* that had been with his father[6]."

Thus it is to be noted that while Polybius in by far the majority of cases used merely 'friendship' or some corresponding word such as '*εὔνοια*,' the four occasions on which he speaks of 'friendship and alliance' refer to a comparatively late time, the years being 163, 158 (*circ.*), 154 and 152 B.C. respectively, and since two of these references are inconsistent with earlier ones, and Polybius himself is so careful a writer, we may infer

[1] Polyb. XVI. 25; XXI. 20, 1, 6; XXX. 20, 3.
[2] *ib.* X. 34, 10; 35, 1. [3] *ib.* XXI. 21, 2. [4] *ib.* XXXIII. 12, 5.
[5] *ib.* XXI. 11, 12. [6] *ib.* XXXIII. 18, 8 (12, 8); cf. *sup.* § 13.

(1) that the phrase '*φιλία καὶ συμμαχία*' was taking the place of '*φιλία*' in the relations of many of the kings about this time[1],

(2) that as the transition is made so lightly by the author, the change in the terms did not put these kings upon a different footing outwardly, but that the treaty was technically no more than one of friendship.

Note also that, according to the passage about Demetrius I, the Romans were beginning about this time to grant their friendship to kings of importance as the reward of loyal service. In the next century there is a parallel in the case of Bocchus.

Use of the terms in Cicero.

§ 15. The next authority in point of time is Cicero, who as an advocate no doubt used technical terms loosely to make his point, but in his constant references to the kings and to Rome's relations with them must as a whole reflect the views, outlook, and terminology of his own day, especially as he was a senator and politician.

His epithet for the kings is nearly always 'amicus' ('amicissimus,' 'fidelissimus'), or 'socius atque amicus.' Thus Antiochus, the young king of Syria, in 70 B.C., "being *friend and ally* intended to dedicate a memorial of his friendship and alliance[2]." Ariobarzanes is mentioned by the same title in a public speech of Cicero (67 B.C.)[3]. In a fragment relating probably to 60 B.C. and dealing with Ptolemy XI Auletes, he protests against this

[1] Compare especially the decree, quoted in the text, which calls Antiochus IV 'friend and ally,' though Antiochus III his father was merely 'friend'; also the relations of Ariarathes IV and of his son.

[2] *Verr.* Act. II. bk IV. 67, 68.

[3] *De imp. Pomp.* 12.

same title being given for a bribe[1]. In 57 B.C. in his speech *De Domo* he asserted that the former Ptolemies had been 'socii atque amici[2].' In another speech (in 55 B.C.) he declares that Tigranes "reigns and holds the name of *alliance and friendship*[3]," while Deiotarus is included in a general reference to the 'socii reges et amici' (45 B.C.)[4]. In a letter also Tarcondimotus is called 'fidelissimus socius amicissimusque,' evidently the title 'socius atque amicus' in the superlative degree (51 B.C.)[5]. These cases, in all of which, except the last, Cicero seems to be using a strictly technical expression, shew that the title 'socius atque amicus' was in general use in Cicero's time and applied to a large number of kings.

Yet the kings to whom he applied it do not seem to have enjoyed a very close bond of union with Rome; their treaties did not guarantee them assistance from their so-called ally. Thus Pompey refused to restore Antiochus of Syria to the throne of his fathers after the defeat of Tigranes, on the ground that the family of the Seleucids had forfeited the kingdom by allowing Tigranes to expel them[6]. This plea would have been impossible and ridiculous, had the terms of the Seleucid's treaty bound Rome to help in case of attack. Again, Ariobarzanes III of Cappadocia asked Cicero as governor of Cilicia for a body of troops, and Cicero, who had received a special commission from the senate to protect him, pleads this special commission only as the justification for sending it[7]. Deiotarus again is

[1] *Frag.* B. XVI. iii. 2. [2] *De Domo*, 52. [3] *Sest.* 59.
[4] *Deiot.* 40. [5] *Ad Fam.* XV. 1, 2.
[6] Append. A, VII. 29. [7] *ib.* IX. 32.

only referred to by name as 'amicissimus,' or as being in the 'friendship' of the Roman people, even where it would have suited Cicero's purpose particularly to be able to refer to the terms of an alliance offensive and defensive. For example in the defence of Deiotarus, Cicero strains the title 'socius atque amicus' to excuse Deiotarus for joining Pompey, making an elaborate plea which would have been unnecessary, had it been possible to plead in defence a definite stipulation in a treaty[1]. The absence of the latter is confirmed by the language of the senate's request to Deiotarus for help against Antony in 43 B.C.[2]

With Ptolemy XI Auletes no less an authority than Caesar states that an alliance was made by law and 'senatusconsultum[3]'; also a treaty was struck with him on the Capitol[4]. So Cicero calls him 'socius' in distinction from his Cyprian brother[5]. But the last reference when compared with others shews also that the treaty was of the same type as those which had long been granted to kings who sought the Roman recognition. Thus this reference goes on to say of the Cyprian Ptolemy, "if he had not yet been *called ally*, he was yet the brother of him who had already attained to that honour from the senate." Dio[6] says that

[1] Cic. *Deiot.* 13, venit vel rogatus ut amicus, vel arcessitus ut socius, vel evocatus, ut is qui senatui parere didicisset.

[2] Cic. *Phil.* XI. 31, senatui placere regem Deiotarum patrem et regem Deiotarum filium, si...copiis suis...iuvissent, senatui populoque Romano gratum esse facturos; itemque si ceteri reges...fecissent, S.P.Q.R. eorum officii non immemorem futurum.

[3] Caes. *B. C.* III. 107.

[4] Cic. *Rab. Post.* III. 6 and cf. Suet. *Jul.* 54.

[5] *Sest.* 57. [6] XXXIX. 12.

"Ptolemy had spent much in order to be *called friend and ally*," and Suetonius[1] too says that the sympathy in Rome for Ptolemy when expelled from Egypt arose from the fact that the senate had *called him friend and ally*, and elsewhere names Ptolemy as an instance, in speaking of those to whom Caesar had sold 'alliances' and kingdoms for bribes[2]. These 'alliances' we see from the passages quoted below[3] are nothing more than the 'foedera' originally granted to kings by way of recognition and described also as treaties of 'friendship' or 'friendship and alliance.' Nor in this particular 'foedus' with Ptolemy do there seem to have been terms stipulating for mutual aid. From the passage in Suetonius which we have just quoted we see that the help which Ptolemy received was given not on account of definite terms in his treaty but merely as to a client who had so lately been acknowledged in due form.

Three other passages must be noticed. (*a*) Hiempsal II is referred to as 'rex amicus' (63 B.C.)[4]. That he was capable of being styled also 'socius atque amicus' is evident from the privileges and services of his predecessors set forth by Sallust[5], from the fact that he had been recognised by Rome[6], and that the recognition of his successor was to be given by the award of that title[7].

[1] *Jul.* 11. [2] *ib.* 54.

[3] Append. B. [4] Cic. *Leg. agr.* II. 58.

[5] *Jug.* 24, Adherbal calls himself 'socius atque amicus.' *ib.* 14, (Adherbal) iam ab stirpe socius atque amicus populi Romani.

[6] As appears from the reference given in n. 4, and from Caes. *Bell. Afric.* 56. [7] Append. A, III. 36.

(*b*) "All the most friendly kings and nations" are said to have been alienated by the outrage inflicted by Verres on the son of Antiochus of Syria[1].

(*c*) Cicero tries to treat Ptolemy of Cyprus as 'amicus' and 'socius,' but shews that he lacked these titles through not having been recognised by Rome[2].

References in Cicero therefore indicate that kings bore generally the title 'socius atque amicus' in Cicero's time, though many of them were still called 'amicus' or 'amicissimus'; that they were however without a treaty which supported the title 'socius' by guaranteeing aid in set terms. They were thus practically on the footing of friendship alone. It may also be noticed that all the kings but one whom Cicero has occasion to mention as 'socii atque amici,' ruled over kingdoms which for many years had been under Rome's protection, and Tigranes had been conquered in war. The use of the title 'socius atque amicus' in the recognition of a king is seen from the instances of Tigranes and of the king of Cyprus.

Caesar (Gallic Wars and Civil War).

§ **16**. Caesar frequently mentions the kings of Asia and of Africa but without having occasion to give them any title but that of 'rex.' But he also refers to a number of princes of Gaul and of Germany, and in each case he refers to them as 'called friend' by Rome. In each case he speaks of the formal 'appellatio,' whether in the case of the more insignificant kings such as Piso the Aquitanian's ancestor (*circ.* 100 B.C.), Ollovico (*circ.* 70 B.C.), Catamantaloedes king of the Sequani (before

[1] *Verr.* IV. 60.
[2] *Sest.* 57, 59.

58 B.C.)[1], or of an important ruler like Ariovistus the German[2]. That Ariovistus was upon a footing of friendship only, we see plainly from his dispute with Caesar. When Caesar summoned him to a conference, Ariovistus declared that the friendship of the Roman people ought to be to himself an ornament and a protection, and not a source of injury: that he would no less readily reject the Roman friendship than he had desired it[3]. Caesar had reproached him merely on the score of ingratitude to one who had procured him the title 'friend[4].'

It is noteworthy that Cassius Dio, as often as Caesar speaks of Ariovistus as 'friend,' adds the term 'ally[5].' Ariovistus however had probably been recognised only by the first title, and Dio has perhaps drawn a wrong inference from the more common custom to this particular case. Had the king been called 'ally' also, Caesar would almost certainly have laid further stress upon this title in upbraiding him.

The full title 'friend and ally' also occurs in Caesar, in connexion with the proposal to recognise Juba[6]. The passage, in which is mentioned the 'alliance' formed with Ptolemy Auletes, has already received comment (§ 15).

Sallust. § **17.** Sallust, who is also reliable as a writer contemporary with the late Republic, is only concerned

[1] Caes. *B. G.* I. 3, 4 (Cat.); IV. 12, 4 (Piso's 'avus'); VII. 31, 5 (Oll.), 'amicus a senatu appellatus.'

[2] *ib.* I. 35, 2, 'rex atque amicus a senatu appellatus.' Cf. I. 43, 4.

[3] *B. G.* I. 44, 5. [4] *ib.* 35, 2; 40, 2. [5] *v.* § 26.

[6] *B. C.* I. 6.

with the African princes, except in the fragments of the *Histories*, only one of which however refers to the status of a king, viz. to the 'friendship' of Eumenes[1]. In the *Jugurtha* the expression 'socius atque amicus' occurs twice, when Adherbal calls himself by that title[2]. If therefore Sallust in many other passages only speaks of 'friendship,' sometimes where 'alliance' would certainly have been added had there been a warrant for its use, this author also shews that the title 'socius atque amicus' was rather a title of honour, in which 'socius' did not represent the binding force of an offensive and defensive alliance. Other passages certainly make most consistent reference only to the 'friendship' of the Numidian kings[3], and in particular even in the plea of Adherbal, where Sallust makes him sum up his claims upon Rome's protection, no mention is made at all of any treaty of 'alliance' or of any terms which bound Rome to render aid[4]. The term 'socius' therefore in 'socius atque amicus' was, so far as Numidia is concerned, justified only by the help which the princes rendered to Rome as friends and clients.

As to the relations with Bocchus, Sallust makes Metellus tell Bocchus that he had "a good chance of forming an alliance and friendship with Rome[5]." Previously however it is said that Bocchus sent to seek a 'treaty and friendship,' and towards the close it is

[1] Sall. *Frag.* 413.

[2] *Jug.* 14, 24. [3] *ib.* 5 (twice), 9, 14 (passim), 17, 24.

[4] *ib.* 24, me manibus impiis eripite per maiestatem imperii, per amicitiae fidem, si ulla apud vos memoria remanet...Masinissae. Cf. *ib.* c. 14, and Append. A, III. 6, 11, 23. [5] *Jug.* 83.

expressly said and several times repeated that Bocchus was to receive a 'treaty and friendship' only on condition of doing Rome a service first[1].

The second fact shews that Roman friendship was in his case a thing to be earned by cooperation in war, as it had been previously earned by Attalus and Hiero, and this excludes the notion that the treaty with Bocchus would secure for him anything but friendship. The fullest meaning attributable to the term 'alliance' in the words of Metellus, is that of a temporary arrangement binding Rome and Bocchus to cooperate until Jugurtha had been subdued. Such an agreement would at least have testified to the king's independence, but like the alliance between Rome and Attalus in the first Macedonian war, would have terminated with the submission of the enemy. Moreover, this favoured position was accessible to Bocchus only when the overtures came from Rome. When Bocchus made the overtures, he asked for the 'treaty and friendship' as one who placed himself among Rome's client-friends, and sought it as the guarantee of peace, and the only means of preserving his kingdom against Rome's displeasure. It must be inferred therefore that the treaty with Bocchus, like that with Numidia, was one of friendship only.

§ **18.** The remaining authorities are either merely translators or compilers, or not contemporary with the Republic.

Livy. Livy in his terminology is most untrustworthy. Sometimes he seems to make no distinction between

[1] *Jug.* 80, 88, 102, 104, 111.

'amicitia' and 'societas.' Thus he says that Philip consented to send proposals to Rome for 'alliance and friendship,' because he desired to cut off suspicion of sympathy with Antiochus[1]. Later he speaks of Perseus renewing "his father's friendship[2]." He translates Polybius's account of the treaty with Antiochus III, in which only friendship is mentioned, but tells us that Antiochus IV renewed the "*alliance* which had existed with his father[3]." With Ptolemy II of Egypt, according to the Epitome of Livy, an 'alliance' was formed, which is very improbable in itself, and is also contrary to the other authorities, while Livy himself contradicts the statement when he describes the "renewal of friendship" in the case of the succeeding Ptolemies[4]. Prusias I accepted "the *friendship* of Rome," but Prusias II "sought a renewal of the *alliance*[5]." The first connexions with Syphax (213, 210 B.C.) were of friendship. In 206 B.C. after an estrangement, friendship, says Livy, was accepted by Syphax, who demanded its ratification by a visit from Scipio. But in 205 and 204 B.C. there is a "strengthening of the *alliance* which had been begun[6]." Similarly, Hiero, Attalus I, and Nabis who became friends on condition of lending assistance, he treats as permanent and genuine allies[7].

[1] Liv. XXXIII. 35, 5. [2] XI. 58, 9.

[3] XXXVIII. 38 (cf. Polyb. XXI. 45); XLII. 6, 8, 10.

[4] Ep. 14. Cf. XXVII. 4, 10; XLII. 6, 4.

[5] XXXVII. 25, 8, 14. Cf. XLV. 44, 8, 9.

[6] XXIV. 48, 13; XXVII. 4, 6; XXVIII. 17, 6; 18, 5. Cf. XXIX. 4, 3; 24, 2.

[7] XXII. 37, 4; XXIV. 6, 4 (Hiero) and cf. XXIV. 28, 6: XXXII. 8, 9 (Attalus) and cf. XXIX. 11, 2; XXXVII. 53, 7: XXXIV. 31, 13 (Nabis) and cf. XXXII. 39, 10; XXXIV. 32, 3.

The terms 'socius' and 'amicus' were interchanged even by Caesar in reference to the Aedui, and Cicero also applied them loosely to the Sicilians in the Verrine speeches[1]. Livy is particularly free in interchanging them, as applied not only to communities but also to kings, so free that his language is perhaps not entirely due to carelessness, but to the fact that in his day, when most kings were obedient to every command of Rome, it mattered little whether they were called friends or allies. The term 'socius' he applies to Hiero, Syphax, Masinissa, Ptolemy Philometor, Antiochus IV, and Eumenes[2], though the other authorities indicate that they were friends and nothing more.

The term 'socius atque amicus,' we have also seen, was applied by such good authorities as Sallust and Cicero to those who were only friends of Rome, but only so far as we can judge when they refer to times later than the third Macedonian war, and then in relation to kings who had become largely subservient to Rome. Livy himself shews the nature and use of this title in the reply to Vermina, son of Syphax, which he ascribes to the senate, viz. "that the Roman people had been accustomed to give the honour of that name to kings *in return for great services*[3]." In ascribing this language to the senate, however, on that occasion Livy seems to have been guilty of an anachronism, and to have interpreted the senate's ancient international

[1] Caes. *B. G.* I. 35, 43, 45; V. 3; VII. 39. Cic. *Verr.* V. 115; *div. Caec.* 17. Cf. *Verr.* II. 2; V. 83; *v.* also *ib.* III. 127; *De imp. Pomp.* 4.

[2] XXII. 37, 4 (Hiero); XXXI. 11, 15 (Syph.); XLII. 26, 7 (Masin., Ptol., Ant. and Eum.).

[3] XXXI. 11, 13.

dealings by the light of the customs of the later Republic. Certainly up to 202 B.C. Rome had had little occasion for establishing this custom or using this title. Hiero was perhaps the only king who had qualified for the title. The kings of Egypt and Macedonia had not, and Syphax never remained loyal long enough. Masinissa's claim would date from this year, but even some years later Livy speaks only of his being called 'king,' when he is being thanked[1], and here his authorities seem to have followed the senate's usual terminology.

Livy applies the full title also to Antiochus III before his war with Rome, though certainly the relations of the two powers did not justify the name[2].

Livy's divergencies from his authorities bring additional uncertainty to his terminology. In passages, which he translates almost literally from his authorities, he is not careful to preserve the terminology of his original but varies without an object[3].

He confirms however the assumption that the title 'friend and ally' was granted to kings as a mark of honour, in return for services to Rome, while the very vagueness of his terminology, and the ease with which he interchanges 'friendship' and 'alliance,' point

[1] xxx. 15, 11; 17, 10. For the significance of this title as conceded by Rome *v.* §§ 40 f.

[2] xxxii. 8, 9.

[3] Thus in the speech of Eumenes; cf. Polyb. xxi. 20, 3, '*φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας*,' with Liv. xxxvii. 53, 7, 'amicitia.' In the same speech the same phrase of Polyb. used in reference to Boeotia is rendered in Livy by 'societas.' Cf. also Polyb. xxi. 21, 11 with Liv. xxxvii. 53, 28, and Polyb. xxi. 35, 4, '*φιλία*,' with Liv. xxxviii. 15, 6, 'pax,' etc.

to a corrresponding vagueness in the Roman official application of those terms to the status of the client-kings.

Diodorus. § **19**. The references in Diodorus are based chiefly upon Polybius and speak generally of 'friendship,' as in the cases of Antiochus III, Philip, Ptolemy VI, Demetrius I, Perseus[1]. On the position of Masinissa, of whom Polybius only says that he 'kept faith' in one war, Diodorus too throws little light, for though Scipio "had the alliance of Masinissa sure for all the remaining time[2]," this may allude to the help rendered by that king down to the end of the war, and Diodorus again states that he maintained 'friendship' with Rome, where Polybius has *πίστις*[3]. In regard to Bocchus the account of Diodorus harmonizes with what we learned from Sallust. Bocchus was "to obtain friendship if he persuaded Marius[4]." Probably, however, Sallust, whose work was finished before 32 B.C., was the authority of Diodorus for this statement.

Diodorus copies Polybius also in the assertion that Ariarathes V asked to renew his '*φιλία καὶ συμμαχία*' with Rome[5], but it must be on another's authority that he calls Contoniatus the Gaul '*φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος*,' in the latter part of the second century B.C.[6] This last passage alone brings fresh evidence. The other passages are only duplicates of those which occur elsewhere, and have no independent value.

Strabo. § **20**. There are few references in Strabo, and these

[1] Diod. xxxi. 8, 1; xxx. 2; xxxi. 30; xxix. 30.
[2] xxvii. 8.
[3] xxxii. 16.
[4] xxxv. 39.
[5] xxxi. 19, 8.
[6] xxxiv. [xxxv.] 63.

may not have much technical significance. Porsena, king of Etruria, "went away a *friend* with honour." Attalus "became a *friend* to the Romans." Masinissa "received much attention on account of his virtue and friendship." The Parthians "had before this bethought them of the Roman *friendship*." Bocchus and Bogud "held the land, being *friends* of the Romans." Artavasdes "was for a time fortunate, being a *friend* to the Romans[1]."

Strabo thus consistently calls the kings 'friends.' Artavasdes, we know, was expected to render help, when called upon (e.g. to Crassus, and to Antony)[2], but he gave it at the dictation of irresponsible triumvirs who treated the kings as subjects, rather than in accordance with the stipulations of a treaty made with the Republic. When Artavasdes refused aid to Crassus, and played Antony false, he was not blamed for having broken a treaty[3]. We know also that his father Tigranes bore the name 'friend and ally,' but the nature of this title has already been indicated as compatible with a footing of friendship[4].

Strabo also uses the term '*φιλία καὶ συμμαχία*,' not only in reference to the community of the Aedui[5], but also in a general reference embracing particularly the kings of Cappadocia. "When the Romans were first regulating Asia, and were making *friendships and*

[1] Strabo v. 2, 2, p. 220 (Porsena); XIII. 4, 2, p. 624 (Att.); XVII. 3, 15, p. 833 (Mas.); XVI. 1, 28, p. 748 (Parth.); XVII. 3, 7, p. 828 (Bocch.); XI. 14, 15, p. 532 (Art.).

[2] Append. A, XIV. 10–11.

[3] Plut. *Crass.* 22; *Ant.* 37, 39.

[4] Cf. §§ 15, 17, *sup.*

[5] IV. 3, 2, p. 192.

alliances with the peoples and kings, to the other kings they granted this honour as a personal one, but to the Cappadocian in common with his people[1]." He appears to mean 'friendships and alliances' to be taken as one phrase, for in the same section he continues, "the royal family having died out, the Romans were for granting the Cappadocians autonomy in accordance with the existing *friendship and alliance*." We have seen that Polybius speaks of Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia being made 'friend' about this time, and of Ariarathes V renewing the 'friendship and alliance,' the second term being inserted without altering the nature of the treaty[2]. It is evident too that among "the other kings" Strabo must include Antiochus III, whose treaty we know was one of friendship only[3]. The passage therefore is another instance of the use of the term 'alliance' in a sense not strictly technical. Events also shew that Ariarathes V's treaty must be thus interpreted, for when he was attacked and expelled by a rival, Rome gave him no active support[4].

Tacitus.

§ **21.** Of the writers who lived under the Empire, Tacitus and Suetonius only concern us in so far as they recall ancient custom, or give us the last stage of the development in terminology which took place under the Republic.

The references in Tacitus in the first place furnish another example of the old practice of bestowing the title 'socius atque amicus' by way of compliment. Thus Ptolemy of Mauretania in return for his services

[1] XII. 2, 11. [2] § 14, *sup.* [3] § 13, *sup.*
[4] Append. A, IX. 16.

was "called friend and ally according to ancient custom resumed once more[1]." In the second place they shew the same loose use of the terms 'ally' and 'alliance.' Thus it is plain that the real relation of Parthia to Rome was one of friendship, Artabanus appealing to the 'friendship and treaty[2],' the common phrase several times used by Sallust[3]. This "old and publicly instituted friendship" is again appealed to years afterwards[4]. Yet the first of these appeals is immediately followed by a discourse of Germanicus upon the 'alliance' of Parthia and Rome, and the second is followed by a request of the Parthian nobles to Rome for "the help that should be given to *allies*." Whether this looseness of terminology is that of Tacitus himself, or whether he is representing Germanicus and the Parthian nobles as straining the terminology for their own ends, is uncertain. In the third place Tacitus indicates the final evolution of the term 'socius,' the logical outcome of the practice of bestowing the title upon one who had done Rome good service as subordinate. It came to designate those kings who were now counted for practical purposes as part of the Roman Empire, and liable to supply contingents. While therefore under the Republic it represented a position of clientship, it has now become identified with that of subject. This consummation is shewn in *Annals* IV. 5, where Tacitus proposes "to review the Roman forces under arms, and *the allied kings*," while in the thirteenth book of the *Annals* (ch. 8), we read that "*the allied*

[1] *Ann.* IV. 26, 4. [2] *ib.* II. 58, 1. [3] § 17, *sup.*

[4] *Ann.* XII. 10, 3 and cf. Mon. Anc. 29, 32, where only friendship is mentioned.

kings were ordered to obey as the needs of the war demanded." It is in distinction to these kings who were thus at the beck and call of the Roman 'imperatores,' that the author of the *Bell. Alex.*[1] called Pharnaces a 'rex externus,' because in spite of the fact that he had been called friend and ally, he was not under Roman influence in the same degree as clients of such long standing as Deiotarus or the kings of Cappadocia.

Suetonius. § 22. Suetonius, like Tacitus, in speaking of 'the allied kings' ('reges socii' or 'socii atque amici') evidently regarded them as part of the Roman organisation and subjects of the Emperor[2]. The passage referring to Ptolemy XI has already been quoted to shew the use of the title 'friend and ally' in the recognition of a king by the senate[3], and it was found to be supported by another passage in the same author referring to Caesar's sale of alliances. The only other noteworthy passage in Suetonius is that in which Claudius is said to have read an old Greek letter of the senate promising Seleucus 'friendship and alliance,' if he remitted the tribute of Ilion[4]. The time referred to is the third century B.C., so that the Seleucus in question was not in any sense a client of Rome. In any case the relations of the powers in the Mediterranean at that time render it unlikely that Rome should for such an object have extended an offer of alliance to Syria, and Suetonius was probably applying

[1] *Bell. Alex.* 34, Domitius turpe populo Romano esse statuit regna sociorum atque amicorum ab externo rege occupari. Cf. *Ann.* XVI. 6, 2, regum externorum consuetudine.

[2] Suet. *Aug.* 48, 60. [3] *Jul.* II. 54; *v.* § 15, *sup.* [4] *Claud.* 25.

the phrase, as it was used in his time, to a period when it was not so stereotyped.

Josephus.

§ **23.** Josephus constantly interchanged '*φιλία*' with '*φιλία καὶ συμμαχία*' and '*συμμαχία*' in speaking of the agreement existing between Rome and the Jews, from the second century B.C. onwards. Josephus himself clearly made little distinction between the two terms, but it is equally clear from the decrees which he quotes that little distinction was also made officially between them by the Roman Senate[1]. The high-priests who procured these agreements with Rome do not fall within the scope of our inquiry, since, though one of them at the beginning of the last century B.C. assumed the title 'king,' these rulers were never really separated from their people in international relations, nor did Pompey after 63 B.C. allow the title 'king' to be retained[2]. Herod, established as king through Antony in 41 B.C., was in full enjoyment of royal rights and powers as they were then understood, and to him after his death we find the title 'friend and ally' applied in a speech of his friend Nicolaus[3]. Herod, we know, frequently received help from Augustus's troops and returned it, but the minute account which Josephus gives of his recognition as king mentions no treaty of offensive and defensive alliance, though asserting that he was intended to serve as a bulwark against Parthia[4]. Evidently no such treaty was necessary, but he gave and received assistance first as the friend of the triumvirs, then as a subject of

[1] Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 163, 164, 259; XIV. 185, 217, 267, 320; cf. also XIV. 146, 147, 194, 197, 214.

[2] Append. A, XVI. (Hyrc.). [3] Jos. *Ant.* XVII. 246.

[4] Append. A, XVI. 1.

Augustus, but always as the protégé and dependent of the Roman State.

Plutarch. § 24. Plutarch only in a few places speaks of friendship with kings. Masinissa is declared to have been a "friend of the people from the beginning[1]." The case of the Mede, whom Antony "brought over to friendship," can hardly be treated as belonging to the Roman State, but as personal to Antony, since the agreement was confirmed by a private marriage alliance[2].

Elsewhere Plutarch speaks constantly of 'alliance' or 'friendship and alliance,' sometimes where other sources shew that the term 'alliance' was not strictly in place. Ariovistus is thus said to have been made 'ally' by Caesar, and Bocchus to have been "enrolled as ally" for his services against Jugurtha, whereas each of these kings according to the testimony of Caesar and Sallust secured nothing but friendship[3]. In connexion even with Porsena (507 B.C.), in spite of the early date and in contradiction to all the other sources, he speaks of 'friendship and alliance[4].' We cannot lay much stress on so conventional a terminology. Plutarch's constant use of the title 'friendship and alliance' must spring from the prevalence of its use in his own time, and like Suetonius and Tacitus he calls the kings as a body 'the allied kings.'

The statement that Bocchus was "enrolled as ally" for his services against Jugurtha must be compared

[1] Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 26. [2] *Ant.* 52.

[3] *Caes.* 19; *Mar.* 32 and cf. §§ 16, 17 *sup.*

[4] *Val. Popl.* 18 and cf. Liv. II. 15, 7; Strab. v. 2, 2; Dion. Hal. v. 34, 4; VI. 74, 5; Cass. Dio, *frag.* 14, 3; Florus I. 10, 2.

with that which says that, as a reward for services against Antiochus, Philip of Macedon was "voted ally[1]." Though the terminology is unsatisfactory in either case, the two passages seem to shew at least the connexion between the 'appellatio' and the enrolment on the 'formula' or list of friends. The other passages give the title 'friend and ally' to Hiero, Machares, son of Mithridates, Phraates the Parthian, and Mithradates his father, and to Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia[2]. Also the king of Gordyene is said to have been called '*σύμμαχος*' by Lucullus at burial[3]. The statement that Mithridates was to be voted '*σύμμαχος*' after his settlement with Sulla must be explained by the fact that the former treaty with Mithridates had been broken and needed renewal[4].'

Appian.

§ **25**. Appian though writing in the second century A.D. does not apply to the kings of the Republican period the terminology of his own day, probably because his work is a compilation from earlier authors. If these authors were numerous, the references are the more important as evidence since they are so generally consistent, and shew a distinction drawn between the terms used respectively in the early and late periods.

The relations of the kings under the Republic are in nearly every case, where the title is applied technically, described as those of 'friendship.' The expression '*allied* kings' occurs twice, both times in reference to the last years of the Republic[5]. One passage alludes to the kings who aided Brutus, the other is the more

[1] Plut. *Flam.* 14.
[2] *Marc.* 8; *Luc.* 24, 30; *Sull.* 5.
[3] *Luc.* 9.
[4] *Sull.* 22.
[5] App. *B.C.* IV. 88; I. 102.

valuable as it confirms the distinction drawn in the *Bell. Alex.* and by Tacitus[1] and states that "the kings *as many as were allied* had to make great contributions to the Roman generals," as opposed, presumably, to the more independent kings, such as those of Parthia or on certain remote borders of the Empire. Another passage, which states that Gulussa "was brought over to an *alliance*" by Scipio[2], can have no further meaning than that of temporary allied help, when we compare the references of Sallust and others to the Numidian house.

The phrase 'friend and ally' occurs with some frequency, but in three cases it is applied to Mithridates VI of Pontus, the nature of whose treaty has already received comment[3]. In two other passages it is applied to the kings Hiero and Pharnaces, respectively, who are said to have received the title as an honour *in return for their services* to Rome, Pharnaces also on the occasion of his recognition as king[4]. Attalus II, again, may also have earned the same title by his services; that he only ranked as 'friend' by treaty appears from other sources already quoted[5]. A temporary alliance may account for the other reference, viz. to Syphax, if the title has in his case been correctly applied[6]. Elsewhere Syphax is made to speak of himself as "a *friend* to both Rome and Carthage."

The references to 'friendship' only are very numerous and embrace very many rulers, viz. Ptolemy II of Egypt (250 B.C.) (who moreover when refusing to aid

[1] § 21 *sup.* [2] *Lib.* 107. [3] § 13 *sup.* and cf. App. *Mith.* 12, 16, 56.
[4] *Sic.* 2; *Mith.* 113. [5] *Mith.* 3 and cf. §§ 13, 14, 20 *sup.*
[6] *Lib.* 28 and cf. 17.

Carthage against Rome asserts that "friends ought to help against enemies, not against friends")[1], Ptolemy IV (196 B.C.)[2], Ptolemy V (190 B.C.)[3], Ptolemy VI (172 B.C.)[4], Masinissa (206, 201, 172 B.C.)[5], Antiochus III (before the Syrian war and also in the terms of his treaty of peace, 190 B.C.)[6], Antiochus IV (172 B.C.)[7], Agron's son, the infant king of Illyria, who by the terms of the treaty made on his behalf was to be called the 'friend' of Rome, so long as he did not seek to extend his borders[8], Attalus I (200 B.C.)[9], Eumenes II and Ariarathes IV (172 B.C.)[10], Mithridates V (before 150 B.C.)[11], Viriathus, by the terms of his treaty (141 B.C.)[12], Machares king of the Bosporus (70 B.C.)[13], Phraates and Tigranes (65 B.C.)[14], Antiochus of Commagene (64 B.C.)[15], Ariovistus (58 B.C.)[16].

That some of these passages are probably duplicates of those already quoted from earlier authorities is evident. Sometimes too the title is applied without any technical significance, as in the words put into the mouth of Nicomedes[17]. Yet all these references in a body confirm the idea which the examination of Polybius, Sallust, Cicero, and Strabo suggested, that the majority of the kings when they came into permanent relationship with Rome entered it as 'friends' and by a treaty of 'friendship,' not by a treaty of alliance binding the parties to render mutual aid; and that if, on the other hand, the terms 'ally' and 'alliance' crept in, they arose from

[1] *Sic.* 1. [2] *Syr.* 3. [3] *ib.* 38. [4] *Mac.* 11.
[5] *Iber.* 37; *Lib.* 61; *Mac.* 11.
[6] *Syr.* 1, 38. [7] *Mac.* 11. [8] *Illyr.* 7. [9] *Mac.* 4.
[10] *Mac.* 11. [11] *Mith.* 10. [12] *Iber.* 69. [13] *Mith.* 83.
[14] *ib.* 106. [15] *ib.* 106. [16] *Celt.* 16, 17.
[17] *Mith.* 13.

the assistance given by the kings to Rome, at first in expectation of reward, later under compulsion as clients. For this assistance they were rewarded in the second century onwards by the appellation 'friend and ally.' More rarely some aid rendered by Rome as protector may have been thought sufficient reason for describing as 'friendship and alliance' what was strictly a treaty of friendship.

The use of the verb '*συμμαχέω*' by Appian means little. The temporary alliance of Attalus with Rome did not put him or his descendants in the position of allies, but merely friends[1]. So when Masinissa swore to help Scipio if he landed in Africa, his connexion with Rome and that of his descendants was still simply one of friendship, as we saw from Sallust[2]. So too the help given by Prusias did not secure for him permanently the position of an 'ally[3].'

Cassius Dio.

§ **26**. The references in Dio and the *Epitome* of Zonaras in regard to the early kings mention only friendship, or employ some neutral phrase as 'agreement.' Besides the 'friendships' with Porsena, Hiero and Syphax[4], we find the statements that "Pompey consoled Tigranes by the thought that he had gained the Roman friendship," and that "Phraates renewed his friendship" when Pompey succeeded Lucullus[5]. This last reference must be compared with another which states that the king made 'friendship and alliance' with

[1] Liv. xxix. 11, 2 and cf. §§ 13, 14, 18, 20 *sup.*

[2] App. *Iber.* 37; cf. § 17 *sup.* [3] *Syr.* 23.

[4] Dio, *frags.* 14, 3; 43, 1 (cf. Zon. viii. 16, 2); 56, 70.

[5] xxxvi. 45, 3; 52, 4. For instances of neutral expressions, cf. Zon. viii. 6; ix. 11; Dio, *frag.* 87, 6; xxxvi. 50, 2.

Lucullus[1], shewing that the 'friendship' and the 'friendship and alliance' in the author's eyes amount to the same thing. Other sources say of the Parthian connexion that it was one of mere 'friendship[2],' and this is confirmed by a subsequent statement of Dio that active cooperation was to be the price of 'friendship.'

There remain a number of passages which speak of an award of the title 'friend and ally,' and of enrolment on a list of 'friends' and of 'allies,' and since all but one deal with the first century B.C., they give good reason to suppose that the practice of conferring the kingly title and of enrolling kings as 'friends and allies' was by this time general[3].

It is true that Dio extends the double title 'friend and ally' erroneously to Ariarathes IV and Ariovistus, who, according to Polybius and Caesar respectively, were only addressed by the title 'friend,' but the frequent occurrence of the full title in Cicero shews that Dio is not merely following the terminology customary under the Empire. Indeed that he chose his terms with some discrimination appears from the frequency with which he denotes the status of the earlier kings by the term 'friendship,' whereas before Dio's time the client kings had come to be designated 'allies.'

That the title 'friend and ally' does not appear from Dio to presuppose a treaty of defensive and

[1] XXXVI. 3, 2. [2] §§ 13, 21 *sup.*; cf. Dio XXXVI. 45, 3.

[3] Dio XXXVI. 53, 5 (Tigranes); XXXVII. 14, 2 (Pharnaces); XXXVIII. 34, 3 (Ariovistus); XLIII. 27, 3 (Cleopatra and Ptolemy); LIII. 25, 1 (Polemo); LI. 24 (Roles); and cf. also XXXIX. 12 (Ptolemy XI).

offensive alliance has been indicated above in reference to Phraates. That it was sometimes given upon the recognition of a king as legitimate monarch appears from the cases of Pharnaces and Ptolemy XI[1]. The case of Polemo[2] who was enrolled on the formula of friends and allies four years after his accession and recognition as king shews that the title was also at times merely an honour, as we have seen from Tacitus and others. More will be said of this in the next section in connexion with the formulae.

Formulae Amicorum and Sociorum.

§ 27. The question of the titles of the kings is also involved with the question as to the nature of the Formula Amicorum and Formula Sociorum.

We know that for military purposes there was a '*formula togatorum*' containing the names of the peoples of Italy liable to supply contingents[3]. And it is supposed that when peoples outside Italy (e.g. the Aetolians) became bound by treaty to aid Rome with troops this '*formula togatorum*' developed into a '*formula sociorum*' in order to include these peoples. We know also from inscriptions that there was a '*formula amicorum*,' on which were entered among others the names of those who had rendered Rome service. Moreover the same source shews that the enrolment followed upon the 'appellatio,' or the act of bestowing the title 'friend[4].'

The very nature of these two lists would seem to make it necessary that they should be kept distinct. It might also be inferred that individuals (other than permanent heads of states) who had done Rome service would be enrolled upon the latter list, as 'friends,' since

[1] *v.* p. 39, n. 3. [2] *ib.* [3] *C.I.L.* I. 200. [4] *ib.* 203.

as members of a commonwealth acting in a private capacity they could hardly be classed with the permanent allies of Rome. Mommsen therefore does not hesitate to say that the 'Senatus consultum de Oropiis' uses 'socius' in relation to Hermodorus incorrectly, relying upon *C.I.L.* I. 203, and he accuses Livy of a similar mistake in relation to Onesimus, i.e. of putting 'formula sociorum' for 'formula amicorum[1].' A passage in Appian may be quoted in support of this view, according to which the Rhodians and other states of Asia were enrolled by Pompey as *friends* in return for their loyal services against Mithridates[2]. Since the Rhodians had had for years an offensive and defensive alliance with Rome, as we know from Polybius and from Appian himself[3], they would be on the list of allies already, and therefore on this occasion must have been enrolled for the sake of honour on a separate list, the 'formula amicorum.'

That there were two lists appears also from the references to the enrolment of kings in Cassius Dio[4].

[1] Liv. XLIV. 16, 7. At the same time, however, this confusion is shared by other authorities. Pausanias (VIII. 30, 8) quotes an inscription from a memorial to Polybius, which states that "Polybius became an *ally* of Rome." Plutarch also says that Archelaus, the general of Mithridates, "was enrolled as *ally* and *friend*" (*Sull.* 23). And as if there had been only one list, the s.c. de Oropiis, after saying that Hermodorus had been called '*ally*' (l. 17), continues in l. 50: "he has remained in the *friendship* of the Roman people." Similarly Livy in his usual way says that the Lampsaceni sought *friendship*, and that "the praetor was bidden to enter them upon the formula *sociorum*" (XLIII. 6, 10). But that mistakes have been made here rather than that friends and allies were mixed on one list must be inferred from the considerations noted above.

[2] App. *Mith.* 61. [3] Polyb. XXX. 31, 20; App. *B.C.* IV. 66.

[4] *v.* § 26, *sup.*

Dio was well versed in state affairs and presumably in the knowledge of official terminology, so that we may with safety take the wording of these passages literally. They consistently speak of kings at the time of the later Republic being enrolled, "*both* among the friends *and* among the allies of the Roman people," i.e. on two separate formulae. If Dio calls Ariovistus 'friend and ally,' it is because he thought he was enrolled on both lists, whereas Caesar apparently had him entered only among the 'amici[1].' But the passages concerning Ariovistus at least shew us the procedure[2]. As *C.I.L.* I. 203 shews us that those who received the title 'friend' were enrolled on the 'formula amicorum,' so we see now that any king who was called 'friend and ally' was enrolled on both lists, whatever was the occasion of his being called so.

Summary. § 28. The results of the inquiry into our authorities may be thus summarised:

(1) The kings are most commonly, except in the last century of the Republic, called 'friends,' and their treaties are known in many cases to have been treaties of friendship.

Thus the treaties of peace with Antiochus III and Viriathus stipulated for friendship, and Hiero's treaty provided for similar relations. According to Polybius Ariarathes IV and Edeco made—Demetrius I wished to

[1] *v.* §§ 16, 26, *sup.*

[2] Dio XXXVIII. 34, 3, *τήν τε κύρωσιν τῆς βασιλείας παρὰ τῶν Ρωμαίων εἰλήφει καὶ ἐς τοὺς φίλους τούς τε συμμάχους αὐτῶν...ἐνεγέγραπτο.* Other passages mark the separation more emphatically by such phrases as "*ἔς τε τοὺς φίλους καὶ ἐς τοὺς συμ.*," "*φίλος τε ἐπὶ τούτῳ καὶ σύμ.*," "*καὶ φ. καὶ σ.*" etc. *v.* § 26, n. (Dio XXXVI. 53, 5 etc.).

make—and Attalus II and Ptolemy VI renewed—treaties of friendship. An inscription of Pergamum confirms this in the case of Attalus II. Ariovistus and three kings of Gaul were recognised as 'friends' according to Caesar. On the testimony of Sallust Masinissa and his successors down to Adherbal enjoyed friendship only, and Bocchus received a 'foedus et amicitia.' Livy shews how Attalus I received friendship as a reward for cooperation in war, Polybius likewise shewing his alliance to have been only temporary. Tacitus applied the expression 'foedus et amicitia' to the relations of the Parthian kings, while by Appian and Dio 'friendship' is all that is mentioned in connexion with many kings of widely distant periods.

(2) The term 'friend and ally' was applied to kings in the second century B.C. and onwards with increasing frequency.

(*a*) We see from the example of Tigranes and Dio's language about Ariovistus that the award of the title was followed by the enrolment of the king's name upon the lists of friends and of allies.

(*b*) It is clear from the references of Dio to Pharnaces, Polemo, and Roles, supported by clear statements of Tacitus in connexion with Ptolemy of Mauretania, and of Livy in respect of Vermina, that the title was given as a reward for services, and was an honour to be earned by loyal clientship.

(*c*) Thirdly, it appears to have been also conferred in the recognition of a king's succession (*v.* § 15, on Ptolemy Auletes), or as a confirmation of the position of a king whether restored to his kingdom after defeat

(e.g. Tigranes), or newly set up by a Roman general (e.g. Pharnaces, Ariobarzanes, Cleopatra and Ptolemy, §§ 15, 26).

The nature of the title is seen especially from the second of the above deductions (*b*). A king was called 'ally' for having helped in the past, not by virtue of a standing alliance binding Rome and himself mutually and equally. His name is entered on the 'formula sociorum,' and by that act not only is he thanked for past services but Rome professes her willingness to use him in future. His acceptance of the title therefore puts his services at Rome's disposal, but we must not infer that those of Rome were necessarily at his disposal. This inequality in the matter of obligations will be discussed shortly.

Since the nature of the title is thus established, it is natural to find it applied in course of time to all client kings individually and collectively.

(3) Since a king who had been 'called friend and ally' could claim henceforth to enjoy 'friendship and alliance' with Rome, the second term was probably inserted with impunity in the treaty of that king or his successor, at the first opportunity. Thus Ariarathes IV bought 'friendship'; he helped Rome against Perseus and probably received the salutation 'friend and ally,' so that Ariarathes V "renewed the friendship and alliance" (Polybius). Antiochus III had a treaty of friendship; Antiochus IV is said to have renewed it when seeking recognition on his accession; he promised aid against Perseus and seems to have sent some elephants[1], and is

[1] Polyaen. IV. 21.

later spoken of as 'friend and ally[1].' The case of the Numidian house, as we saw from Sallust, and that of Attalus II, as appeared from an inscription of Pergamus, seem to shew that the treaty was not always altered by the insertion of the term 'alliance.'

The third result then will be that where we find treaties of 'friendship and alliance' mentioned as existing between Rome and the kings, we must infer that such treaties only bound Rome to friendly interest, and put those who sought them on a footing of clientship, not of strict alliance.

We found that this conclusion was supported (*a*) by the fact that a transition is so easily made in the narrative from 'friendship' to 'friendship and alliance' without any comment by the authorities. So Polybius treats the cases of Ariarathes V and Ptolemy VI, and Appian that of Mithridates VI, while in Cassius Dio Phraates who was said to have made a 'friendship and alliance' with Lucullus, yet "renewed the *friendship*" with Pompey. The phraseology of Livy and Plutarch is equally uncertain.

The following facts may also be alleged in support.

(*b*) The help given by Rome was not usually of an active nature. She did not trouble to enforce her mandates except where her own interest was much involved. In many cases she did not interfere at all. The appeals

[1] The connexion between the title 'friend and ally' and the wording of the treaty may be gathered from a comparison of Cic. *frag.* XVI. iii. 2 with Suet. *Caes.* 54. Cicero's protest against giving the title 'socius et amicus' for a bribe evidently refers to the 'societates ac regna' sold by Caesar and other demagogues.

to her, as for instance that of Alexander Balas, shew by their nature that the terms of the treaties did not bind her to assist. When Rome granted aid, she could claim to do so as one who was "not accustomed to forsake her friends[1]."

(*c*) The help given by those kings who were recognised by Rome was theoretically voluntary, as for example that given by Deiotarus, Masinissa, and Hiero[2]. It was not the outcome of the terms of an alliance.

§ **29**. Though it has just been said that the help rendered to Rome by the kings was in theory voluntary, yet a king, who consented to be called the friend and ally of a vastly superior power, found it difficult to refuse assistance when it was requested, whereas the superior power by reason of its strength did not lie under the same necessity of lending its assistance. Rome therefore, while choosing to assume that the kings would upon occasion put themselves at her service under penalty of her displeasure, could not be compelled to assist in turn. When a king, then, accepted from Rome the title 'friend and ally,' he accepted therewith a position of inferiority. It is therefore natural that we should find that kings were generally recognised only as 'friends' until after the battle of Pydna, in 168 B.C., when Rome's power became paramount in the Mediterranean, and then accepted with increasing frequency the additional title 'ally,' as motives of interest or necessity compelled them to acquiesce in a position

[1] Caes. *B. G.* I. 33, 2; 35, 4; 43, 8. For the nature of the Roman aid and instances *v.* §§ 60, 88, 90, *inf.*

[2] *v.* § 59, *inf.*

subordinate to Rome. Thus it is only in decrees or inscriptions after this date that we find the full title 'friendship and alliance' applied to the treaties with kings, whereas Masinissa and Perseus had been recognised by the title 'king[1],' Antiochus III, Ariarathes IV and Ptolemy VI acknowledged as 'friends' and Philip received peace without any such title of recognition[2]. When the double title is applied to Hiero and the 'friends' of the third century B.C. the authorities are late as Appian, and they draw a false analogy from the practice of later times, or use the title in a different or non-technical sense.

§ 30. We have already distinguished the temporary alliance as having no influence on the permanent relations of a king with Rome, but as simply earning for the king 'friendship.' This equal or temporary alliance was the rule when Rome so needed assistance that she could not but consent for a time to a footing of equality, as in her first dealings with Attalus I and Masinissa. Bocchus had a chance of securing a temporary equality but he delayed until Rome was free from her main difficulties, and then he had to be content with a subordinate position.

The client-king's treaty, then, was one of friendship, sometimes designated 'friendship and alliance.' Nearly all the client kings helped Rome at various times, and sooner or later earned the title of honour 'friend and ally,' if not by active service, at least by expressing

[1] Liv. XXX. 15, 11 ; 17, 10 ; XL. 58, 9 ; XLI. 24, 6. On this confirmation of a king's sovereignty *v.* § 40 f.

[2] Pol. XVIII. 44 ; Liv. XXXIII. 30, 6.

their subservience and readiness to help. Since this title was then also employed in recognising the power of a new king, it is thus explained how the kings, though unbound in most cases by any definite treaty of offensive and defensive alliance, and though shewn to be in reality simply 'amici' with a treaty of 'amicitia,' came to be designated first 'reges socii atque amici,' and finally 'reges socii.'

PART II

ACTS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE CLIENTSHIP.

Terms of Extant Foedera.

§ **31.** Beneath that vague terminology which has just been discussed, and those titles which outwardly suggested equality, there was a very real subordination of the weaker 'friend' to the stronger. This subordination or clientship must, as has been said above, be deduced from occasional acts and functions. It was of a 'de facto' nature and developed in most cases gradually. Thus in the terms of the several 'foedera' between kings and the Roman people which have come down to us, there is no outward expression of the real inequality of the contracting parties. The treaty with Hiero did little more than arrange for a cessation of (*Hiero.*) hostilities. The king was to restore captives and pay a hundred talents as indemnity[1]. Diodorus[2] adds that he was to be recognised as lord of the Syracusans and the towns then under his sway; peace was made for fifteen years but the treaty when renewed at the end of that period stipulated everlasting friendship[3].

[1] Polyb. I. 16, 9. [2] Diod. XXI. 6. [3] Zon. VIII. 16, 2.

(*Philip.*) § 32. Philip of Macedon in 197 B.C., when he surrendered unconditionally and his kingdom was restored to him by Flamininus, was bound by the terms of his treaty (1) to evacuate Greece, (2) to pay an indemnity, a thousand talents down, and a thousand in ten yearly instalments (not a tribute therefore), and (3) to give up all his warships but four[1]. None of these terms implies clientship or dependence, except that the third was meant probably to restrain him from a naval policy. Livy[2] adds two stipulations, the second of which would at once make the king a client, (4) not to keep more than five thousand armed men, nor any war-elephants, (5) not to wage war outside Macedonia without leave. Livy's authorities however have here evidently made an error, perhaps in trying to excuse Rome's subsequent treatment of Philip and Perseus. The latter frequently made war outside Macedonia without a protest from the senate[3]. Niese points out that Philip had no war-elephants. Nor can Livy's account be accepted in contradiction to that of Polybius. Plutarch[4] moreover, while differing from Polybius as to the number of ships which Philip was to keep, agrees with him in the omission of the last two stipulations.

(*Perseus.*) § 33. A short time after this treaty Philip is said to have been invited to make 'friendship and alliance' with Rome, to shew that Antiochus III need not look to him for support[5]. This friendship and alliance Perseus is said to have renewed upon his accession[6]. Unless therefore this renewal was made conditional

[1] Polyb. XVIII. 44. [2] Liv. XXXIII. 30, 6.
[3] Append. A, v. 3 (b). [4] *Tit.* 9. [5] Liv. XXXIII. 35, 5.
[6] *ib.* XL. 58, 9.

upon the observance by Perseus of the terms of the peace of 197 B.C., those terms did not affect his position at all. Livy[1] however makes the Roman envoys claim that Perseus like his father was bound not to wage war without Rome's consent, and in his whole account confuses the treaty of peace with the later treaty of friendship which he says was made by Philip and renewed by Perseus. Even supposing that there had been this binding clause in the treaty of peace, it is very doubtful whether it would have applied to Perseus. Since the evidence has been shewn to be against the existence of such a clause, we know of nothing that expresses in definite terms the clientship of Perseus.

(Antiochus III.)

§ **34.** The terms of the peace with Antiochus III of Syria, who surrendered to Rome in 190 B.C., provided according to Polybius and Livy[2] (1) that there should be everlasting friendship between Rome and the king; (2) that Antiochus should evacuate Asia west of Mount Taurus, abstain from war in Europe, and be confined by sea within the promontory Sarpedon and the river Calycadnus; (3) that he should pay an indemnity, part down, and part in ten instalments; (4) should surrender his elephants and warships, and keep no elephants and only ten warships in future. Corn also was to be given to the Roman army while in Asia, and hostages were to be sent to Rome. The second stipulation was a limitation placed upon his foreign policy, but merely to preserve intact the sphere of Rome's influence. Antiochus was to abstain as from another's territory. The giving of hostages was to safeguard the payment

[1] Liv. XLII. 25. [2] Polyb. XXI. 45; Liv. XXXVIII. 38.

of the indemnity. If Rome detained Demetrius, son of Seleucus, after it was paid, she did it to oblige Antiochus IV and allow him to keep control without a rival, while he remained loyal. The fourth term however was a restriction put upon the development of his resources. He was to be cut off from a naval policy and to be weakened in his land forces. Since the friendship was to exist so long as he kept the terms intact[1], he was so far dependent upon Rome, as without their consent he might not build a fleet or strengthen his army with elephants.

So long however as he did this, and abstained from aggression in a westerly direction, he was perfectly independent of Rome. The treaty also provided for arbitration in disputes between himself and Rome's allies[2], but this was necessary to make the above restrictions effectual. If an ally of Rome assailed him, he was free to repel his attack[3]. This last clause is worthy of notice. Conquered Carthage did not receive this freedom but had to refer in each case to Rome. Antiochus was free from this severe restriction which brought the republic of Carthage to the verge of slavery.

(*Seleucus IV.*) Since friendship with Rome is in this case included in and dependent upon the terms of peace, Seleucus, in renewing the friendship in 187 B.C., was doubtless bound by all the terms of the above treaty, unless it were otherwise provided. In particular he had to

[1] Polyb. xxi. 45, 1.

[2] For an instance see Liv. xxxix. 22, 9 (dispute between Eumenes and Antiochus said to have been settled by L. Scipio).

[3] Polyb. xxi. 45, 24.

discharge the part of the indemnity which remained unpaid. Whether Antiochus IV, his successor, was similarly bound is more doubtful. When he is said to have renewed the friendship which had been with his father[1], it may not literally imply a renewal of the same treaty. At any rate neither the king himself nor apparently Rome considered all the clauses of that treaty to be yet in force. For he acquired a large number of elephants and a fleet[2], and when these were destroyed after his death by the senate's commissioners, no attempt is made at justifying that act, except that it was necessary to weaken Syria. Moreover the commissioners, who went to inspect his kingdom in his lifetime, raised no objection to them as a breach of the treaty though the king was extremely subservient to them. Rome even accepted a present of elephants from him as help against Perseus[3]. It may be observed too that Antiochus paid the last part of the indemnity at the same time that he requested the renewal of friendship[4]. (*Antiochus IV.*)

§ **35.** Tigranes of Armenia in 66 B.C. surrendered unconditionally but received back his kingdom on certain conditions[5]. The only expressed limitation to his sovereignty was the condition of leaving his kingdom to an heir named by Rome, his son Tigranes, and even this lapsed in consequence of the latter's disgrace and execution. The other conditions were the surrender of (*Tigranes.*)

[1] Liv. XLII. 6, 8.
[2] Polyb. XXXI. 12, 9.
[3] Polyaen. IV. 21.
[4] Liv. XLII. 6, 6.
[5] Cic. *pro Sest.* 58, hunc Cn. Pompeius...certis rebus imperatis regnare iussit.

his late conquests and the payment of an indemnity in a fixed sum[1].

The 'foedus' first made with Attalus I, which, as has been pointed out, differed from the other 'foedera' above mentioned, in that it lasted only during the war against Philip, need not here be quoted. It was essentially an alliance on equal terms, and provided for the manner of cooperation during the war, and what share each should have of the booty.

The Majesty of Rome.

§ **36.** We cannot find then any expression of clientship in those 'foedera' and agreements of which the terms have come down to us[2]. The only such expression found in any treaty of friendship or alliance is that which occurs in the treaty with the Gaditanians and other commonwealths, "Maiestatem populi Romani comiter conservanto[3]." Cicero has much to say upon this stipulation. Besides rejecting his opponent's explanation that 'comiter' is an archaic form of 'communiter,' he says that the imperative 'conservanto' represents an order, not a request. And "when," he adds, "the majesty of one people is bidden to be preserved, and no mention is made of the other, that people whose majesty is defended by the sanction of a treaty, is placed upon a higher footing." It is in the first place therefore an expression of clientship. He further states that "this clause does not occur in every

[1] Append. A, XIV. 3 f.

[2] The treaty with Agron's infant son, king of Illyria, may also be mentioned. He was to be a friend of the Romans so long as he did not seek to acquire land or power outside his present boundaries (App. *Illyr.* 7).

[3] *pro Balb.* § 35, 37 (Cicero contends that the Gaditanian treaty was not really a 'foedus').

treaty," implying that it was not uncommon. We know that it occurs in that with the Aetolians of 187 B.C.[1] But it is not safe to infer that it appeared in a treaty with any king. It is absent from those made with Philip and Antiochus, although they were humbled about the same time as the Aetolians. The treaties with the Ptolemies, renewed by each successor in turn, dated back from a time when Rome was certainly not in a position to claim such a superiority. Nor were the first relations of Masinissa and Eumenes with Rome compatible with such a claim upon the part of their friend and ally. Ariarathes IV of Cappadocia, and Prusias I of Bithynia, it is true, adopted of necessity a more humble attitude, but there is no mention of such a clause in connexion with these kings[2]. What happened in the case of the 'foedera' granted to newly made kings in the first century B.C. by the demagogues and triumvirs is uncertain[3], but those who simply received the title 'friend and ally' without a treaty were not exposed to such an express stipulation.

(Other contents of treaties.)

§ **37.** The terms of treaties must also have varied greatly in other ways. Cicero says that but for the addition of the above clause there was nothing in the Gaditanian compact but the stipulation that there should be 'pia et aeterna pax.' In other treaties with republics, e.g. the Foedus Cassianum[4], and that with the Astypalaeans[5], the terms of peace and friendship are

[1] Liv. XXXVIII. 11.

[2] Append. A, II. 1 f.; III. 1; VI. 6; IX. 1 f.; VIII. 1 f.

[3] In some cases at least the sole effect of the compact was the recognition of the princes as 'reges.'

[4] Dionys. VI. 95. [5] *C.I.G.* II. 2485.

expressed at much greater length. We cannot therefore form any general conclusion as to the contents of the treaties of friendship with the kings; they may have varied considerably in contents and length. It may however be suggested that sometimes they contained merely the clause providing for friendship or friendship and alliance, with the addition of such stipulations as that the territorial rights of each party should be respected by the other, that no hostile acts should occur nor succour be given by one to the enemies of the other[1]; that in other cases, in view of the desire to secure merchants and traders, arrangements were made for the security of that class, and for the settlement of disputes as regards contracts between the subjects of each country. Such arrangements we find in the Foedus Cassianum, in a Carthaginian treaty[2], and in one with Thisbae[3], and the large number of Italians present in various kingdoms for trading purposes makes it likely that similar provisions stood also in treaties with kings, e.g. with those of Numidia[4].

§ **38.** We next come to the principal acts and functions which constituted these 'de facto' clientships. They were as follow:

(1) Recognition of the king's authority by the senate.

(2) Subordination of the king in matters of foreign policy.

(*a*) Rome's consent must be obtained for wars and treaties.

[1] Cf. App. *Hisp.* 69–70 (treaty with Viriathus), Polyb. III. 22, 25 (those with Carthage), and *v.* Append. A, I. 3 f.

[2] Polyb. III. 22, 7–9. [3] Bruns, *Font.* p. 162. [4] Sall. *Jug.* 26, 87.

(*b*) The kings submit to arbitration.

(*c*) Rome sends commissioners to inspect the relations of the kings with their neighbours, and examine their attitude towards herself. (This became unnecessary when Rome gained territory in their neighbourhood, as in 133 B.C. in Asia.)

(*d*) Rome expects aid in various crises.

(3) Obedience to the summons (evocatio) of a Roman general, who demanded the king's presence at his quarters. (This custom was of late growth, arising in the last few years of the Republic.)

(4) Though no regular tribute was exacted from the kings by the senate, the irregular exactions to which they were liable were not the least prominent feature of their clientship.

In declaring her own obligations as protector Rome seems to have been content with the profession that she did not allow her friends and allies to suffer any loss or injury. How far she was serious in this profession will be discussed later.

Recognition.

§ **39.** We have seen that in the second century B.C. and onwards a king, who accepted the title 'friend' or 'friend and ally' of Rome, placed himself in the position of a client, and was expected to help Rome in emergencies; that even if he had a treaty with Rome, this treaty implied the same relationship; that both title and treaty could be granted by Rome upon the first accession of a king, whether the kingdom had been inherited by him in the ordinary way or entrusted to him by a

Roman general[1]. Whereas therefore in the third century B.C. certain kings (e.g. the Ptolemies) formed friendships with Rome without parting with any of their freedom, it was quite a different matter, if, when the term had come to bear a stereotyped meaning and implied special obligations, every king who had regard for his security, sought Rome's friendship above all others as the main guarantee of his sovereignty. We are not confronted merely with the case of kings renewing their predecessors' relations with a foreign power, but we have presented to us the phenomenon of all the crowned heads in the Mediterranean coasts feeling themselves secure upon the thrones, to which they have succeeded, only when their authority has been recognised by the predominant power.

Renewals of friendship.

Hiero's[2] sovereignty over the Syracusans was recognised expressly by a clause in the treaty of peace, but generally the recognition was conveyed in a treaty of friendship, or else by the process called 'appellatio[3],' and in many cases it was awaited with evident anxiety and courted in the most humble language. Perseus in 178 B.C., Antiochus IV in 175 B.C., Ptolemy Philometor in 171 B.C. sent to renew the friendship that had existed with their respective predecessors[2]. Antiochus, as one who had seized the throne in the absence of the heir, then a hostage at Rome, accompanied his request with the promise that he would never come short in any act of service[2]. Ariarathes V of Cappadocia in

[1] *v.* § 28.

[2] Append. A, I. 3 (Hiero); v. 4 (Pers.); VII. 5 (Ant.); II. 3 (Ptol.).

[3] *v.* § 40 *inf.*

164 B.C., when he obtained the renewal of the friendship which his father had been compelled to buy, "thought his sovereignty secure because he had won the goodwill of Rome, and sacrificed thank-offerings to the gods[1]." Demetrius I, who seized the Syrian throne in the senate's despite, in 162 B.C., could only extort the promise that "he would gain friendship, if he did everything in his power to satisfy the senate[1]." Alexander Balas, again, before attempting to eject Demetrius took care first to secure Rome's sanction, which was given him as "the son of a king, friend and ally[1]." Mithridates VI also appeared to have renewed the friendship and alliance that had existed with his father.

Another feature of the recognition is that it was frequently secured beforehand for the reigning king's heir. Attalus II was thus introduced to the senate by Eumenes with that object, and Attalus in turn sent his nephew "to renew (on his own account) the friendship that had been with his father." Ariarathes V and Prusias II likewise sent their sons to Rome professedly for the same purpose[2]. It was a variation of that precaution when Masinissa entrusted to Scipio the division of the kingship between his three sons, and when, in the last century of the Republic, Ptolemy Auletes made the senate guardian of his children and executor of his will[2].

'Calling king.'

§ **40**. There is still surer evidence of the clientship of the kings in the other form of recognition, whereby

[1] Append. A, IX. 10 (Ariar.); VII. 16 f. (Dem.); *ib.* 20 (Alex.); X. 2 (Mith.).

[2] Append. A, IX. 17 (Ar.); VIII. 7 (Pr.); III. 21 (Mas.); II. 27 (Ptol.).

the senate claimed the power even of confirming or bestowing the royal title. That this bestowal had the same effect as the grant of the title 'friend and ally' is shewn by a comparison of two passages in Polybius about Demetrius I[1]. In several cases, e.g. those of Perseus[2] and Ariovistus[2], both titles seem to have been conceded. We hear of the Syrian usurper Tryphon[3] that "he was anxious to confirm his sovereignty by a decree of the senate," in which presumably he would have been addressed as king. Perhaps the most striking instance is that of Masinissa[4], who, although he had regained the sovereignty of his tribe and had cooperated with Rome, was "called king by Scipio," and then "sought that the royal name and the other benefits of Scipio might be confirmed by the senate[5]."

Further, as the title 'friend and ally' could be repeated by way of honour in the case of a king already 'called friend' by the senate, so one who had been already recognised as king might, like Ptolemy of Mauretania under Augustus, receive the title once more as a compliment for services he had rendered[6].

[1] Polyb. xxxii. 4, 3: (Demetrius) *πάντα ποιήσειν* 'Ρωμαίοις *ἀναδεχόμενος ἕως ἐξειργάσατο βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν* (the commissioners) *προσαγορευθῆναι.* He sends to procure the senate's confirmation of this title, and receives the reply "*τεύξεται τῶν φιλανθρώπων ἐὰν τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῇ τῇ συγκλήτῳ.*"

[2] Append. A, v. 4 (Pers.); Caes. *B. G.* i. 35, 2 (Ariov.).

[3] Append. A, vii. 23. [4] *ib.* iii. 3 f.

[5] Masinissa was one of those whom, according to the claim of P. Scipio, Rome had made kings from weak and unimportant dynasts (Polyb. xxi. 11). According to Livy he bore the title king in Africa before he was honoured by Rome (Liv. xxix. 3, 10; 24, 3).

[6] *v.* § 21.

Even the repetition of the name in a decree was thought to bring additional honour, though it had only occurred incidentally. Thus Cicero speaks of the senate having frequently called Deiotarus king in the most honourable decrees[1].

Causes of the necessity for this Recognition.

§ **41.** The necessity of this formal recognition is not explained merely by the predominance of the Republic in the Mediterranean. Even if the desire to stand well with so overshadowing a power were sufficient to account for the regular request made by successive kings for the renewal of friendly relations, it is yet to be explained why the royal title should have been thought to possess full authenticity when it was conferred by the senate. The necessity of the recognition lay also in the special character of the kingships of the period, and further in the notions entertained by the Romans with respect to sovereignty and the 'foedus.'

(a) (Nature of Mediterranean kingships. Absolutism.)

A special feature of these kingships was their absolutism. The successors of Alexander held their domains some time before they assumed the title 'king.' They had come into possession of them by military force, and held them by military force, and they bequeathed them as personal property to the successor of their choice, generally their eldest son. The power over the domain is absolute, and the people are as servants upon an estate, with no control over its management[2]. Hence it was that the last kings of

[1] Append. A, xii. 20.

[2] Of the peculiar kingdom of the Attalids, an estate seized by its steward, this goes without saying. In Egypt part of the king's revenue came from assessments on the land, i.e. the land in general, not merely his own separate estates. Holm iv. ch. 5, p. 122. Holm says,

Pergamum, Bithynia and Cyrene could bequeath their kingdoms to Rome when they were without an heir of their own body. In this and other matters the people are not considered; the only person with whom relations can be established is the master of the country and people, and the exception of Cappadocia noted by Strabo[1] only confirms the general practice. The tribal kings of Numidia seem to have been similarly independent of their subjects. Masinissa bequeathed to his three sons not only his private possessions but the sovereignty of the country, and it was as the adopted son and heir of Micipsa that Jugurtha received his share of the kingdom.

There could therefore be no continuity of relations between the countries of these kings and foreign powers such as is possible through the modern idea of kingship, namely that the king merely represents the

"Egypt was for the Ptolemies a great, landed estate from which as much profit as possible is extracted, and the submissive inhabitants of which are well treated, because the more ready they are to work, the greater the return from the property. The Ptolemies viewed their rule over Egypt from the standpoint of individual right." Even in Asia, where the Seleucids governed on different lines, these sovereigns, says Holm (p. 118), "sought to play the part of absolute rulers." The cities of Greek type founded and encouraged by them in such numbers did not affect the relations of the king to the whole empire. Their independence was confined to internal affairs, and though they could insist on this with the boldness of Greeks, they had no voice in the king's disposal of the country as a whole. At the same time it is not denied that these communities were a disintegrating force and contributed to the break-up of the empire.

In Bithynia even as early as 250 B.C. we find King Nicomedes leaving his kingdom by will, and requesting, not the people of Bithynia, but certain neighbouring powers to see that his will is carried out (Holm, *Gk. H.* IV. ch. 9, p. 199).

[1] *v.* § 20.

people, so that his death does not interrupt the existing treaties between his people and another. In the ancient theory, when the lord of the country died, and his heir succeeded, the latter might be liable to pay debts incurred by his father, as Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV discharged the indemnity which the senate laid upon Antiochus III, but, as a perfectly irresponsible being, he could repudiate any other engagements contracted by his predecessor. Perseus[1] thus claimed that "the treaty concluded with his father had nothing to do with himself," and he would have been in the right, had he not confessedly renewed the treaty of friendship upon his accession.

(*b*) (*Title 'king' not territorial.*)

Another feature of the kingship of Alexander's successors is the manner in which the royal title was separate for the most part from any territorial basis. Holm[2] has pointed out that the Diadochi, in order to secure the position they had won by force, propagated the doctrine that *βασιλεία* was not necessarily hereditary but belonged to the ablest; that, on the other hand, when no less than nine generals had established themselves with the title, they again made use of the hereditary claim, and all professed to be descended from the Macedonian house. The sovereignty therefore of these kings was that universal sovereignty of Alexander the Great, claimed in full by each ruler, though he possessed only a fragment of Alexander's empire. How far from being territorial in the eyes of the Greeks was Alexander's sovereignty appears from the absence of any special Greek word for empire, the idea that a

[1] Append. A, VII. 3, 5. [2] Holm, *Gk. H.* IV. ch. 3, note 2.

large territory could be under a single government being foreign to their notions[1]. It is seen also in the circumstance that two could bear the royal name at the same time in the same country, as the son of Antiochus III bore it with his father[2]. So in Sicily Gelon was called king and reigned jointly with his father Hiero[3].

Since the kings of our period were in most cases descended from those who had seized the title for themselves without any hereditary justification, who moreover did not possess the title as a territorial one, but, having possessed their territories some time before they assumed the title, could only regard the latter as an adjunct to their position, it is not strange to find that they were prepared to look for confirmation of their kingship to a foreign power. Even if the continuous succession to the sovereignty by two or three generations of the same family might be expected to have removed in the descendant's mind any need for such a confirmation, yet the character of that kingship was the same in essence at the beginning of the second century B.C. as at the beginning of the third, viz. it was absolute, and the king did not derive his title from the vote of a council or popular assembly but assumed it as an adjunct to the inheritance. To gain therefore from a power as great as Rome a formal address by his royal name was valuable to him, not only as a moral support against the aggressions of neighbouring peoples, but as a guarantee of his proper succession and dignity in the

[1] Holm, *Gk. H.* IV. ch. 1, p. 37, last note.

[2] Hieron. *in Dan.* XI. 19; 2 Macc. ix. 23; *Zeitschrift v. Assyr.* VIII. 109.

[3] Diod. XXVI. 24; *I.G.D.It.* 3; *B.C.H.* XX. 400.

eyes of his people, and thereby a deterrent to rival claimants. Nor were such rival claimants infrequent. Whether their claims to be related to the late king were true or false, the personal nature of the kingship, and the fact that the people, having no share in the government, cared little who ruled them, provided that he was not too harsh, often enabled them to prove formidable to the legitimate heir. We may again extend the argument to Masinissa and his descendants, whose kingship was above shewn to be similarly absolute, and in whose experience rivals were just as formidable.

§ **42.** It was inherent therefore in the nature of those kingships that every sovereign on his accession should seek not only to be recognised by Rome as friend and ally, but to be addressed by the royal title, and that both forms of recognition became so common that other kings, even the German chief, Ariovistus, became subject to the same necessity. We have so far discussed the question from the standpoint of the kings. From the Roman standpoint too the recognition seems to have been equally necessary.

(*c*) (*Duration of the Roman 'foedus.'*)

About the duration of the Roman 'foedus' the evidence that is forthcoming has been generally divided, according as it related to a treaty of 'friendship' or one of 'alliance[1].' In the case of the kings the difficulty is increased by the fact that a nominal alliance was frequently coupled with friendship, and now inserted, now omitted, without any apparent rule. Treaties of

[1] Mommsen, *Staatsr.* III. 1, 594 f. Ferrenbach, *Amici populi Romani*, p. 75.

friendship made with republics were permanent (εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον)[1]. Three references shew that this applied also to treaties with kings[2]. A grant of the Roman friendship to a private individual was generally more than permanent; it was hereditary. But a special clause was inserted securing the grant and the privileges attaching to it in favour of the children and descendants[3]. On the other hand no such clause was, so far as we know, inserted in any of the treaties with kings, and we find the son of Antiochus III sending to renew the friendship that had been made with his father 'for all time.' And if stress may be laid by analogy upon the relations between Tarquin and the Latins, we may cite the reply of the latter to Tarquin, to the effect that the treaty made with his grandfather had lapsed at that monarch's death, because no clause had been inserted extending the arrangement to his posterity[4].

(Treaties of Friendship.)

When we pass to treaties of alliance we are reminded by Paulus[5] that "an alliance can be formed 'in perpetuity,' i.e. while the contracting parties live, or for a time." This is followed later by the statement that "no alliance can be contracted 'for ever[6].'" A republican government however may be said never to die, so long as the state exists, so that we find that those treaties[7] of alliance which are not made as a

(Treaties of Alliance.

[1] Liv. VII. 30, 1 (Campanians); Dionys. Hal. IV. 49, 1; Cic. *pro Balbo*, 35.

[2] Polyb. XXI. 45, 1 (Antiochus III); Diod. XXVII. 8 (Masinissa); Zonar. VIII. 16, 2.

[3] *C.I.L.* I. 203. [4] Dionys. IV. 46. [5] Dig. 17, 2, 1. [6] *ib.*

[7] In this section the word 'treaty' will only refer to 'foedera,' the strictest type of Roman compact. The agreements made with all the

temporary expedient continue in existence for some centuries when they are contracted with a republic. The treaty with the Latins[1], for instance, which contains provisions for alliance, prescribes peace so long as heaven and earth continue. The treaty of alliance with Rhodes instituted in 167 B.C.[2] is appealed to by Cassius after 125 years[3]. So the treaty with the Astypalaeans institutes peace, friendship, and alliance for all time[4]. On the other hand, in the case of kings it is obvious, if we follow Paulus, that the 'foedus,' so far as it can be called one of alliance, terminated with the life of the king, and did not extend to his posterity, but needed renewal[5]. The treaties with the kings were shewn to be treaties of friendship, in which the term alliance was frequently inserted, but without being supported by clauses providing for that alliance. Whether of friendship therefore or of friendship and alliance, they seem to have been regarded by the Romans as terminating with the life of the king.

(d) (The Roman kingship.)

§ 43. Again, this theory of recognition is closely related also to the nature of the kingship, as it existed in Rome. It was elective, and the 'imperium' had to be conferred upon each successor by a vote of the curies before he could hold office[6], just as, under the Empire,

kings, whom Rome met in the first century of her expansion, were of that type. An attempt is made to shew that though 'Sacrosanct' the 'foedus,' whatever were its terms, naturally was ended with the king's life.

[1] Dionys. Hal. VI. 95, 2.

[2] Polyb. XXXI. 7, 20. [3] App. *B. C.* IV. 66.

[4] *C.I.G.* II. 2485.

[5] For the temporary 'foedus' of alliance with Attalus see Append. A, VI. 1, 2.

[6] Warde-Fowler, *City State*, p. 75.

all the powers of the emperor had to be conferred upon him by a special law. The late emperor's heir succeeded to his property, but not to his 'imperium' until that law had been passed. The 'imperium' is a thing apart, incapable of being bequeathed. Rome cannot therefore recognise a king's heir and successor as king, merely because he has inherited and succeeded to his father's domain. With the latter succession she does not profess to interfere save indirectly; it is to the former that she claims to be able to withhold her consent. Thus she could leave Demetrius I in possession of Syria as his inheritance, but at the same time refuse to call him king[1]. The refusal of course did ultimately act upon Demetrius's safe possession of the inheritance, in that it encouraged a rival claimant to come forward, who, having procured his recognition by Rome, expelled Demetrius with foreign aid. Again, under the Empire Herod Archelaus was careful to refuse the title 'king,' until he had received it from Augustus[2]. Augustus in fact allowed him to retain a third part of the old kingdom as one of the three surviving sons of Herod, but withheld the title 'king,' "until he should have deserved it[3]." That the Romans, in contemplating the authority of the kings of the Mediterranean, mentally referred to their own 'imperium,' appears from the custom of presenting them with all the insignia of their highest magistrates. As the title was shewn to be non-territorial from the Greek standpoint, so it will appear that the Romans mainly so regarded it, because

[1] Append. A, VII. 17.
[2] Joseph. *Ant.* XVII. 202; cf. XVI. 295, and Tac. V. 9, 3.
[3] *ib.* XVII. 317.

their own 'imperium' was likewise of a non-territorial nature[1]. It is true that Deiotarus is called 'rex Armeniae' by Caesar, and that the grant of the royal name was often accompanied by an extension of territory[2], but on the other hand, apart from the practice, illustrated above, of separating the title from the inheritance, we may compare the methods by which Rome used the name. On the principle that the power of 'imperium' was indivisible, but could be conferred in its entirety upon two or more without diminishing its force, Rome could, as arbitrator, cause the two Ptolemies, Philometor and Physcon, to reign in Alexandria simultaneously, each with full and undiminished sovereignty[3]. So Scipio could divide the power of Masinissa between his three sons, without dividing the territory, in such a way that each received full sovereignty and the title king, but confined himself to certain departments of the state executive. The son of Deiotarus of Galatia, and Ptolemy of Mauretania were each called king in his father's lifetime[4]. Deiotarus, Vonones of Parthia, Antiochus Philopappus kept the title after losing their kingdoms[5]. Brogitarus and Contoniatus seem to have received the title without an addition of territory[6]. Ariobarzanes and Deiotarus gained honour according to Cicero by the mere repetition

[1] It has been pointed out to me, however, that the 'imperium' was limited in the case of the Roman provincial governors, except when it was specially provided otherwise.

[2] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 67 (Deiotarus); Dio LX. 24 (Cottius).

[3] Append. A, II. 8. [4] Cic. *Deiot.* 25; Eckhel (coins), 4, 160.

[5] Append. A, XII. 8; Tac. *Ann.* II. 4, 5; *C.I.L.* III. 1, 552.

[6] Cic. *Har. Resp.* 29; Diod. XXXIV. (XXXV.) 63. Contoniatus had apparently only a single city.

of the name in the 'senatus consulta[1].' Even Ariovistus, outside the Roman sphere of influence, received it in confirmation of an authority that he had long possessed[2], and Masinissa, when for some time already he had been in unchallenged possession of his ancestral territory, laid stress upon obtaining the 'royal name,' as well as the extension of territory granted by Scipio[3]. Perseus when captive, it is true, "had to forget the name of king," but probably not because he had lost his territory, but because by war he had broken the treaty, which had confirmed his sovereignty[4]. Certainly Tigranes, even while 'αἰχμάλωτος,' had been addressed by the title 'king of kings,' probably before his kingdom was restored to him[5].

§ 44. When Rome therefore came into contact with these kings, the inherent nature of their sovereignty coincided in its effects with the Roman conceptions of kingship. The renewal of 'foedera' was necessary from the standpoint of the kings because, though their kingdoms and in some measure their kingship were inheritable, the absolute and personal nature of their power prevented a perfect continuity of relations. From the Roman point of view a fresh recognition was necessary because the successor, before assuming the full position occupied by his predecessor, had to receive his sovereignty by a special measure, and was not until then king in the proper sense. Our own modern theory of kingship would not only have removed the necessity

[1] Append. A, IX. 26 ; XII. 20.
[2] Caes. *B. G.* I. 35, 2 ; App. *Celt.* 16.
[3] Append. A, III. 4. [4] Liv. XLV. 4. [5] Dio XXXVII. 6.

for recognition but have secured a continuity of relations. In the first place the king being viewed as a 'corporation sole,' the kingly office may be said to be permanent, and the individual holder is lost sight of in it[1]. There is no interruption caused by death. The eldest son is 'ipso facto' king and is proclaimed immediately. In the second place, the king not being the absolute lord of the country, relations can be established with his people and thus be continuous.

Circumstances attending 'Recognition.'

§ 45. Every king then upon his accession, if he wished to have behind him the support of Rome, sought recognition in one of three ways. If his predecessors had made a treaty with Rome, he sent to seek for a renewal of that treaty. If no such treaty existed (and not all kings received such a privilege), he asked to be called friend, or friend and ally. Or, again, he requested the senate to call him king by a decree of honour. No hard and fast limits can be assigned to the use of each method. At first, however, the treaty was the usual way of initiating friendship[2]. When a request is made for friendship, 'foedus et amicitia' is the usual expression employed, though we have seen that later custom first added, and then sometimes substituted, the expression 'societas.'

The striking of the 'foedus' took place on the

[1] Maine, *Anc. Law*, chap. VI.

[2] Besides the treaties of peace stipulating also friendship, which were made with Hiero and Antiochus III (*v.* Append. A), we find treaties of friendship made also with the kings of Egypt from Ptolemy II onward (*ib.* II. 1, 3), with Philip, with the Pergamene kings, the Cappadocian Ariar. IV, Mithrid. V of Pontus, Ptolemy XI, and Parthia. Such a treaty was promised to Bocchus. Many also were sold by demagogues in the last days of the Republic (*v.* § 78).

Capitol and was attended with such formalities as the slaughter of a sow in the forum and the pronouncement of an ancient formula by the 'fetiales[1].' These old formalities afterwards fell into disuse and were only revived by the emperor Claudius. It is almost certain however that, in the second century B.C. and onwards, kings were sometimes merely called 'king and friend' or 'friend and ally' by the senate without the additional safeguard of a treaty, and that the publication of the decree containing the title took the place of the latter, as in the case of Hyrcanus, when his position had been settled by Caesar[2]. Thus there is no mention of a 'foedus' in the cases of Ariovistus and of Herod, only of decrees of the senate, though the relations of the one, and the institution of the other as king, are described at length and with care by Caesar and Josephus respectively[3]. Cicero does not mention a renewal of treaty with Ariobarzanes III, but only frequent 'appellations' by the name of king in the decrees for his safety. Moreover Cicero's communication to Ariobarzanes, viz. the decree by which he himself as proconsul was empowered to look after the king's safety, was evidently in place of the more formal recognition[4]. In the civil war the senate recognised Juba, but manifestly without a treaty, for the latter required to be sanctioned by a law of the people[5]. Conquered kings also, restored to their thrones, were

[1] Suet. *Claud.* 25.
[2] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 144 f. Cf. XV. 386, also XIII. 259 f.
[3] Caes. *B. G.* I. 35; 43, 4; Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 385.
[4] *v.* Append. A, IX. 26.
[5] Sall. *Jug.* 39; Liv. XXXII. 23, 1; Polyb. XVIII. 42, 6.

sometimes bidden to reign on certain conditions without a treaty of peace being granted. This fortune befell Tigranes, who nevertheless was consoled by Pompey because he had gained the Roman friendship[1].

The kings who were acknowledged without a treaty were in much the same position as 'civitates sine foedere liberae et immunes.' Those who gained a treaty were not called 'foederati[2],' probably, as Bohn suggests, because in their case the 'foedus' was temporary in so far as it ended with their death.

Between the use of the title 'king' and that of 'friend' in the recognition formalities we have seen that there was no essential difference. The full title 'friend and ally' however, it has been suggested, was of later use, as an expression of the clientship of kings and the services which they came to be expected to render Rome[3].

Title 'king of kings.'

There are two instances in which Rome allowed the title 'king of kings' to be borne by her clients, those of Tigranes and of the Bosporan kings[4]. The latter instance belongs to the Empire, and the title was borne in virtue of the tribal kings under the Bosporan's sway. Tigranes probably did not continue to bear it officially, but Pompey after his victory, in accordance with the Roman principle 'parcere subiectis,' honoured him

[1] He was enrolled as friend and ally by Pompey, but this enrolment probably followed upon a simple decree; *v.* Append. A, XIV. 1.

[2] Fest. p. 218 b, cum populis liberis et cum foederatis et cum regibus.

[3] § 28 f.

[4] Dio XXXVII. 6; *C.I.G.* 2123, 2124. Antony also granted the title to Caesarion, but without warrant. Dio XLIX. 41.

with it while a captive, though he refused it to the Parthian, whom he wished to humble.

It may be mentioned that when certain disturbances occurred in Rome, states, whose relations had lately been affected by wars in their neighbourhood, sent to Rome to have their treaties and privileges confirmed. This would certainly be the case rather with cities and republican states (as for instance those of Asia after Sulla's victory[1]), but a dynast also, the Jew Hyrcanus, after Caesar's death likewise petitioned that Caesar's decrees might be laid up in the treasury[2].

The acknowledgment of a king at first rested with the senate. Demetrius I failed to obtain it from that body, though he had obtained it from the commissioners[3]. Later the people also granted the title, encouraged by the tribunes[4]. If a 'foedus' were made, we have said above that a law passed by senate and people was necessary.

Use of the diadem.

The practice followed by the emperors of placing the diadem on the king's head, when granting him the royal dignity, was not established under the Republic. The nearest approach to it was the act of Pompey, who, when Tigranes laid aside the diadem as suppliant, replaced it on his head as a sign that he was to be restored to his place[5]. The act of Lepidus, as guardian of young Ptolemy V, represented on the well-known coin, is legendary[6]. The presence of 'diademata' in the passage of Dionysius[7] about gifts is a mistake, for

[1] *C.I.L.* 30920 ff. [2] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 221. [3] Append. A, VII. 16 f.
[4] Cic. *Sest.* 56. [5] Dio XXXVI. 35; Plut. *Pomp.* 33.
[6] Append. A, II. 2 (b). [7] Dionys. III. 61.

the diadem is nowhere else mentioned as sent to kings, though the gifts sent are frequently enumerated.

Gifts.

§ **46.** In connexion with the present discussion may be mentioned also the senate's custom of sending gifts to their friends among the kings. It is true that gifts were sent generally only to a king of tried loyalty who had done Rome service[1], but in the case of Ariovistus at least, of Ptolemy VI, and seemingly of Masinissa[2], they accompanied the first formal recognition of the royal dignity, and the loyalty of the recipient had not been tested. These gifts were originally intended as an honour to kings 'sui iuris,' and did not in any way imply the superiority of Rome[3]. But the ascendancy of the giver could not fail to be emphasized, when the king humbly petitioned for a renewal of such attentions, as Antiochus of Commagene begged for the "renewal of his toga praetexta[4]."

The full king (rex) received the 'insignia' of triumphing Roman magistrates, the embroidered toga and tunic (at other times the 'toga purpurea'), the sella curulis and ivory staff, a gold crown, a gold dish, and sometimes military gifts, horses in trappings, arms, and military cloak[5]. A gold seal, and gold and silver

[1] Caes. *B. G.* I. 43, 4. [2] Caes. *ib.*; Liv. XXVII. 4, 7; XXX. 15, 7.

[3] Dionys. v. 35 (Porsena received them). Appian (*Pun.* 32) calls them '*χαριστήρια τῆς συμμαχίας*.'

[4] Append. A, XIII. 1.

[5] Liv. XXX. 15 (when presenting the gifts 'toga picta' etc., Scipio says, "neque magnificentius quicquam triumpho apud Romanos neque triumphantibus ampliorem eo ornatu esse"). Cf. also Liv. XXVII. 4, XXX. 17, XLII. 14; Diod. XXXI. 28; Caes. *B. G.* I. 43, 4; Tac. *Ann.* IV. 26. In Tac. *Hist.* I. 54, II. 8, 'iunctae dextrae,' or a pair of clasped hands made of gold or silver, are mentioned as a symbolic gift, but not in reference to kings.

vessels were also sent to Masinissa at various times[1]. The 'reguli' received only the 'toga praetexta,' the garb of the curule magistrate when not triumphing. A distinction was in this way made between king Syphax and the 'reguli' in Africa[2]. Antiochus of Commagene, though entitled 'rex,' received the 'praetexta,' because of his unimportance[3]. The custom seems to have fallen into abeyance for many years before the consulship of Caesar, who revived it in favour of Ariovistus[4], perhaps as profitable for his pocket. Before this, the last mention of it is in the case of Ariarathes V (160 B.C.). It again fell into abeyance however, for Tacitus refers to it as obsolete, when he speaks of its revival in honour of Ptolemy of Mauretania[5].

Effects of the 'Recognition.'

§ **47**. Having discussed the circumstances of the 'recognition,' and the necessity for it, we must shew its effect upon the position of the kings. Nothing contributed more to their increasing dependence upon Rome than this necessity attending every succeeding heir of securing the Roman goodwill and countenance. There fell to Rome in consequence three main prerogatives. In the first place, when disputes occurred as to the succession, appeals were made to her as the only possible arbitrator. Secondly, she was enabled to threaten the reigning monarch with the transference of her favour to another member of his house. Thirdly, she reserved to herself the right of withholding her recognition with a view to the annexation of the kingdom.

[1] App. *Pun.* 32; Liv. xxxi. 11, 11. [2] Liv. xxvii. 4.
[3] Cic. *ad Qu. Fr.* ii. 10, multa dixi in ignobilem regem.
[4] Caes. *l. c.* [5] Tac. *l. c.*

Settlement of the succession by Rome.

In order to understand the first of these powers reference must be made once more to the nature of these ancient kingships. Since the people were not regarded as the source of the royal power, they had no claim to arbitrate between rival claimants either through a vote of the majority or by any other peaceable means. They could support this or that claimant by arms, and the one who had the stronger following drove out the other, but his claim was not thereby established, nor his position permanently secured. How long such a struggle could continue without the strong intervention of an outside power is seen in the history of Syria[1] from 118 B.C. onwards, and of Parthia and Armenia over a century later. On the other hand when Rome was willing to arbitrate (and nothing suited her policy better), an authoritative decision was given which frequently settled the claims of the competitors as though by legal right in the eyes of all concerned. She thus divided Cappadocia between Ariarathes V and Orophernes, the Egyptian sovereignty between Ptolemy Philometor and Ptolemy Physcon, Numidia between Adherbal and Jugurtha[2]. In all these cases her decision was accepted, and held good until fresh quarrels broke the peace, and fresh influences came into play. Other occasions upon which Rome intervened were when Sulla established Alexander II, son of Ptolemy Soter, on the throne of Egypt in 81 B.C.[3], and when Caesar, on behalf of the Roman people and senate, settled the succession in 48 B.C. after the death of Ptolemy Auletes, that king having named the senate

[1] Append. A, VII. 25 ff.

[2] *ib.* II. 9 (Ptol.); III. 27 (Adh.); IX. 16 (Ariar.). [3] *ib.* II. 19.

executor of his will and specially requested it to accept the heirs named therein[1]. Rome was, as has been said, the only possible arbitrator, not only because of the authority that accrued to her from the practice of conferring the royal title at the request of the kings, but because she alone had the strength requisite to support her decisions. Whether she was willing to use her strength is another matter, and here she was often dominated by her own selfish policy. Divisions in a strong kingdom were always to her advantage, tending to make the country more and more subject, and though it may be said that the senate was far too preoccupied to restore peace in every family struggle, it is noteworthy that her decision was almost invariably in favour of dividing the inheritance, even though she had previously confirmed it in the possession of one[2], and thereby she encouraged petitioners; further, that when her decision was disregarded, she frequently remained content to see the strife continue, in the hope, probably, that it would weaken the country's resources. There seems to have been in her mind in these as in Italian questions the maxim 'Divide et impera.' Her mode of arbitration was doubtless influenced also by certain principles of the Roman law of inheritance. In the first place "the Roman idea of sovereignty became very lax owing to the part played in its transmission by testament and adoption[3]." Thus it was through her influence that Micipsa adopted Jugurtha and left to him as to his own sons a share in the kingdom[4]. Later, the emperors made constant use of succession by adoption. Further,

Rome's method of arbitration.

[1] Append. A, II. 27 ff. [2] For examples *v. supra.*
[3] Maine, *Anc. Law*, chap. VI. p. 195. [4] Append. A, III. 26.

in Roman law no regard was paid to primogeniture in wills. When the succession was 'ab intestato,' the children succeeded in a body[1]. Moreover the identity of the individual who succeeded was only of importance in so far as he represented the family and preserved the continuity of the 'gens' or clan[2]. Even a whole family or 'corporation' could inherit the sum total of rights or 'universitas iuris' which constituted an inheritance. With these ideas the Roman practice in dealing with the succession among the kings was altogether in harmony. While she respected the family succession, she had little respect for the particular individual who should succeed. Thus on the one hand, when Rome confirmed a new king in possession, stress is laid on the fact that his *ἀρχή* was an *ἀρχὴ πατρῴα*, e.g. in the case of Alexander Balas of Syria[3], Nicomedes III of Bithynia[4], Pharnaces of Bosporus[5]. Strabo says that in Syria the Romans were ashamed to put an end to the family succession (*τὴν κατὰ γένος διαδοχήν*) in the line of Seleucus Nicator, since they themselves had ratified it[6]. Caesar adjudged to Mithridates of Pergamum a tetrarchy of Galatia on the ground of his family relationship (iure gentis et cognationis)[7]. Herod of Judea was surprised at receiving the kingdom from the Romans "since their custom was to give it to those of the same family (*τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ γένους*)[8]." Augustus claims to have shewn similar consideration for the royal stock of Armenia[9].

[1] Maine, *Anc. Law*, chap. VII. p. 227. [2] *ib.* chap. VI. p. 183.
[3] Polyb. XXXIII. 18, 10. [4] App. *Mith.* 7.
[5] *ib.* 113. [6] XIV. 5, 2. [7] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 78.
[8] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 386. [9] *Monum. Ancyr.* 27.

On the other hand, that it mattered little what individual member of the royal family succeeded appears from the readiness with which the senate divided an inheritance between two or more brothers, or transferred its favour from one to another. Ariarathes V, having succeeded his father as sole heir, had been duly recognised by the senate, but when some time after Orophernes, his half-brother, claimed the kingdom as heir, the senate had no hesitation in cutting off for him a portion of the kingdom as a separate inheritance. When Eumenes II had reigned alone for many years, the senate, as a token of displeasure against him, wished to transfer to Attalus part of his territory as a separate kingdom and was disappointed when the good sense of Attalus and his advisers led to a courteous rejection of the offer[1]. In Egypt Ptolemy Physcon was raised to an equality with his brother, though the latter had been long before recognised as sole sovereign[2]. Micipsa, as said above, would not have made Jugurtha co-heir with his sons, if he had not seen that the wishes and perhaps intentions of the senate were directed towards such a settlement[3]. The whole history of Syria[4] from the death of Seleucus IV is sufficient proof in itself how careless Rome was in respect of the claims of the individual. Antiochus IV was recognised as king—though the son and heir of Seleucus was at the time in Rome—nominally on the ground of the latter's infancy. When Demetrius came of age, and Antiochus IV had left an infant son to succeed him, Rome preferred to detain Demetrius and leave the boy upon the throne

[1] Append. A, VI. 18. [2] *ib.* II. 3, 8 f. [3] *ib.* III. 26. [4] *ib.* VII. 4 ff.

under the care of regents. Demetrius escaped and set the boy aside. Rome was content to withhold her recognition until Demetrius should have deserved it. Meantime, as soon as a suitable rival appeared, she recognised him as the son of Antiochus IV, and blessed his enterprise. Between the two branches of the family the strife continued without any attempt on the senate's part to effect a settlement until Tigranes annexed the country. Though Rome's abstention was largely dictated by self-interest, it is plain that she settled the succession of the kings without respecting rights of primogeniture, and regarded not the individual but the family.

Control over the king.

§ 48. The second of the powers which resulted to Rome from the practice of recognition was the control over the conduct of any king who was compelled by his position to set any store by that recognition. He would be tractable until he had procured it, and could always be kept in fear of renunciation and of the transference of Rome's favour to another member of the royal house if he offended his patron, the senate. Here again, as the kingship was of a personal nature, and the king's relations with Rome also personal, it was particularly easy for the senate without any trouble to itself to exert an influence upon his fortunes. Rome had no need to treat him as an enemy, that is, as an equal, by declaring war upon him. She could simply transfer her patronage to another member of his family and thus separate the ruler from his people. She could shew disfavour to him, while preserving good relations with the rest of the family. The latter she could regard as permanently under her influence and favour,

the ruler as temporarily so, that is, while he deserved it. While she could so easily encourage a rival without labour to herself, the reigning monarch was bound to cultivate her goodwill. The truth of this may be seen from the cases already mentioned, of Eumenes and the Syrian kings, viewed from another standpoint. Eumenes had no alternative but to submit to the most galling treatment at the hands of the Roman commissioner, who even established a court of inquiry against him in the centre of his own kingdom (165 B.C.)[1]. Had Attalus been willing to dissociate himself from his brother, he would have found, at the senate's signal, many supporters not only among the Pergamenes, but especially among the cities which Rome had placed beneath the jurisdiction of Eumenes. The senate never took steps against Demetrius of Syria in 162 B.C. While it excited his zeal to secure recognition by leaving him some hopes of it, a hint was given to the neighbouring kings, e.g. Ariarathes, through ambassadors, not to form any ties with him, that he might be isolated. This was quite sufficient to encourage a rival claimant in the person of Alexander Balas. The senate had evidently been awaiting such a contingency, and recognised him, though his claim to be the son of the late king was most improbable. He did Rome's work for her, and justified the attempts of Demetrius to silence intending rebels by securing the Roman warrant for his title[2]. After the death of Demetrius, the senate for years never interfered in Syria, but by the judicious use of the recognition always retained the

[1] Append. A, VI. 16. [2] *ib.* VII. 16–20.

Syrian kings at her beck, as several acts of homage on their part bear witness[1]. In Egypt too the senate tried to bring pressure to bear in a similar way, when Philometor at its bidding refused to receive back his brother, and so forfeited the Roman friendship. Here however the attempt failed owing to the weakness of Physcon and his want of popularity among the Egyptians[2].

Refusal of 'Recognition' and Annexation.

§ **49**. The third possibility presented to Rome by the practice of recognition was that of paving the way to the annexation of a kingdom upon the death of its king by withholding her recognition from his successor. This power she did not attempt to exercise until the last century B.C., and even then there seems to have been, at least during the senate's régime, much feeling against it, especially where there was a successor who could prove any title to the throne. The annexation of Egypt and Cyprus[3] was the first to be mooted and much was alleged in its justification. In the first place those who had assumed the diadem in each country were not of the royal stock, and the Cyprian, at least, not kingly in character[4]. It was also claimed that the last king had bequeathed Egypt and Cyprus to the Romans, but the genuineness of that bequest was much discredited, and little stress seems to have been laid upon it[5]. To confuse the issue the annexation of kingdoms was at this time one of the main items of the democratic programme[6], and political strife ran high between the popular party and the senate upon

Egypt and Cyprus.

[1] Append. A, VII. 23, 26, 27. [2] *ib.* II. 9, 11.
[3] *ib.* II. 20. [4] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 42. [5] *v.* § 84 *inf.*
[6] For the proposal of Crassus in 65 B.C., *v.* § 84 n.

this same question. Egypt was scheduled in 63 B.C. for annexation, in the agrarian law of Rullus. Moreover the country was so strong through its situation that neither party wished its opponents to secure control of it, while the prospect of gain excited a keen personal struggle for the right of restoring the king. The matter was thus left in suspense, and from 80 to 59 B.C. neither king could by any representations obtain a confirmation of his title. At last the triumvirs, seeing a chance of profit, took up the matter and confirmed Ptolemy of Egypt in return for a huge bribe[1]. The Cyprian Ptolemy was less generous and therefore less fortunate, and was left at the mercy of Clodius, whose proposal to confiscate the king's possessions was carried in the assembly in 58 B.C., and Cato was sent to take over the same. The king committed suicide. Cicero drew a pathetic picture of the king in all his regalia thus coming 'under the auctioneer's hammer[2].' The principle however was laid down in this way by at least one party in the state, that Rome had a right to annex a kingdom, if she judged the reigning heir unsuitable and unworthy of recognition.

Syria. In 64 B.C. took place the annexation of Syria. The weakness of its rulers had been recognised by the Romans, says Strabo, but, as we quoted above in another connexion, "having themselves ratified the family succession in the line of Seleucus, they did not like to take it away[3]." This again shews that there was considerable prejudice against annexing a kingdom

[1] Plut. *Caes.* 48; Suet. *Jul.* 54.

[2] *pro Sest.* 57 f. See also Append. A, II (Cyprus).

[3] § *v.* 47, *sup.*; Append. A, VII. 28.

while the royal house had living representatives. Lucullus therefore, when he took away Syria from the defeated Tigranes, restored it, after a lapse of fourteen years since its occupation by that king, to another Antiochus of the Seleucid dynasty, an act quite in accordance with the old senatorial policy, which had left Syria to its own weak kings and domestic strife, so long as from time to time they acknowledged the Roman supremacy. Pompey saw that a change was necessary to secure peace and safety to the Empire's borders, and since interference with the internal management of a kingdom was, as will be shewn later, inconsistent with the Roman idea of imperium, his only remedy was annexation[1]. His claim that Rome had more right to rule Syria as the conqueror of Tigranes than the Seleucids whom Tigranes had expelled, cut the knot of Rome's responsibility as nominal protector of the Seleucids, but it was at the same time only another way of saying that his government was not bound to recognise a new member of a family which had proved to be incapable of protecting itself.

Numidia.

The next case was that of Numidia. The proposer of the annexation, Curio, was evidently for the time associated with the demagogues who sought to further their agrarian schemes by the confiscation of kingdoms and royal treasures. This policy Cicero mildly rebukes in his speech against the agrarian law of Rullus[2], quoting opinions to the effect that "the Roman people ought not to seem covetous of every kingdom." But in this case others besides demagogues were opposed to

[1] Append. A, II. 35 f. [2] *Leg. Agr.* II. 41.

the establishment of Juba, the optimate Marcellus vetoing a senatorial proposal to recognise him as friend and ally[1], and the senate who wanted Juba's aid in the coming civil war had to leave the matter for a time in suspense.

§ 50. The above facts at least shew that, until a king was recognised, his kingdom was not safe from annexation, and that with the object of annexation in view recognition might be withheld from him altogether. If so little advantage was taken of this principle under the Republic, that we do not find a single case of annexation actually carried out, save when the kingdom had been forfeited by right of conquest, or the title of the new king to his inheritance was invalid, the practice of the emperors was far different. Augustus very soon made it clear that the continuance of the royal line upon the throne depended upon his good pleasure. He made Galatia a province on the death of Amyntas, though the latter left sons to succeed him[2]. He was angry, says Josephus, with Aretas of Arabia for not communicating with him before taking the sovereignty, and his annoyance was the greater because he had not intended to continue the succession but wished to give the country to Herod[3]. Upon the death of Herod in Judaea, though Augustus had previously granted him permission to settle the succession as he liked[4], Sabinus the legate seized the royal possessions to take account of them temporarily, until the late king's will should

'Recognition and Annexation' under the Principate.

[1] Caes. *B. C.* I. 6.
[2] Dio C. LIII. 26.
[3] Jos. *Ant.* XVI. 295, 352.
[4] *ib.* XV. 343; XVI. 129.

have been confirmed by Augustus, and Archelaus not only refused the title 'king' until the latter had given his sanction but finally received Judaea only as ethnarch with the promise of the higher title if he deserved it[1]. In A.D. 7 he was tried and banished for misgovernment and his country annexed[2]. That a change had come over the Roman policy is indicated by Augustus himself when he claims that he could have made Armenia a province but followed the 'mos maiorum' instead by 'giving a king' from the royal stock[3]. A notable instance of the older policy, opposed to annexation, was the recognition of Hiempsal II as king of Numidia after the Jugurthine war, when an annexation of the country as conquered territory might have been expected[4]. The different treatment of Syria by Lucullus and Pompey has already been mentioned. Lucullus viewed the question as a follower of the old school, to whom the dignity of kingship and the claims of descent were not things which could be lightly and contemptuously overridden. Pompey in the light of more advanced ideas, who had himself in his youth summarily put to death Hiarbas of Numidia[5] and had witnessed the frequent falls and restorations of the Cappadocian and Bithynian kings, had little more respect for royalty than the leaders of the socialist and democratic party.

Old and new policies.

One further case must be noticed in connexion with recognition and annexation. The Cappadocians, as we have already quoted from Strabo, were so specially favoured by Rome above the other peoples of Asia

[1] Jos. *Ant.* XVII. 195, 202. [2] Dio C. LV. 27, 6; Strabo XVI. 2, 46.
[3] *Mon. Anc.* 27. [4] Append. A, II. 33. [5] Liv. *Ep.* 89.

under monarchies, that a treaty was made with them as well as with their king[1]. The same writer continues that when the royal family became extinct, the Romans were for granting the people freedom in accordance with the existing friendship and alliance with them, but the latter refused it and were allowed to choose a king for themselves. In this case therefore the permanence of the treaty with the people as a people, prevented the possible consequence of the extinction of their line of kings, viz. annexation. A second time they enjoyed the effects of this safeguard when the line of Ariobarzanes also became extinct in 42 B.C. The treaty however was disregarded under the Empire, for upon the death of Archelaus in 17 A.D., Tiberius made the country a province[2].

Foreign policy of the client prince.

§ **51**. Not as allied to Rome by treaty nor yet simply as her friend, but because the superiority of Rome claimed complete deference to her wishes in return for her friendship, that is to say, because the prince was 'in fide populi Romani[3],' the ruler who sought the Roman recognition studied Rome's interest in his foreign policy.

(*a*) *Roman friendship paramount.*

In the first place the king made no friendship at all with one who was not a friend of the Romans. Hiero, having helped Rome against Carthage in the first Punic war, felt himself at liberty to succour

[1] Append. A, IX. 3.
[2] Dio LVII. 17; Tac. *Ann.* XII. 45.
[3] Caes. *B. G.* II. 3, 2; Liv. XLV. 13, 7.

Carthage after the peace of 241 B.C. because that city was then friendly to Rome[1], but when war again broke out there was no question which path Hiero was to pursue, and the friendship which he had resumed with Carthage was again broken off. After Thrasimene he despatched help to Rome, saying through his representative that "he had been so grieved by the disaster that had befallen C. Flaminius that no catastrophe to himself and his kingdom could cause him greater distress[2]." Following the instructions and example of Masinissa, the kings of Numidia professed "to trouble about no ties with any other people save the Roman, and to accept no new alliances or treaties, on the ground that they would find ample protection in that one friendship: if the fortune of the Roman Empire changed, the Numidian house was to fall along with it[3]." Micipsa again instructed his sons to consider the Roman people in the light of kinsmen[4]. Adherbal claimed that after the fall of Carthage in 146 B.C. his house had no enemy except perchance someone whom the Romans bade them so consider[5]. When Prusias II had offended Rome and forfeited her friendship, the senate called upon all the states of Asia to withdraw from friendship with that king[6]. Ariarathes V of Cappadocia on the advice of Roman envoys broke off his friendship and marriage connexion with Demetrius I of Syria, whom the senate had refused to recognise[7]. Ariobarzanes I assumed the surname Φιλορώμαιος,

[1] Polyb. I. 83, 1. [2] Liv. XXII. 37, 5. [3] Sall. *Jug.* 14, 18.
[4] *ib.* 14, 1. [5] *ib.* 14, 10. [6] Append. A, III. 24.
[7] Diod. XXXI. 39; Polyb. XXXII. 5, 1; Justin XXXV. 1, 2.

indicating that Rome's friendship was judged paramount and sufficient, the source of dignity and safety, to the exclusion of other friendships. The same title was assumed a little later by Antiochus of Commagene[1].

That the Numidian house did not seek the friendship of any other power was due probably to their isolated position, and the fact that they possessed no navy. Most of Rome's clients exchanged tokens of friendship with other states that were friendly with Rome. Hiero had a cordial understanding with many, to whom he also zealously sent aid in their various difficulties. To Egypt he sent corn, fish and wool in time of famine[2]. Rhodes he helped likewise with money and presents after the earthquake there in 224 B.C., and remitted tariffs in her favour[3]. He also helped Carthage, as already mentioned[4], against the rebel mercenaries. Moreover he made a marriage alliance between his son, Gelon, and a grand-daughter of Pyrrhus of Epirus[5], and cultivated the friendship of other Greek states[6]. The goodwill of the Greeks was sought also by the Ptolemies[7], and by the Syrian[8] and the Pergamene kings[9]. Eumenes II and Antiochus IV, Attalus II and Alexander Balas acted in cooperation to secure the Syrian throne for Antiochus and Balas respectively[10]. Other connecting links were the intermarriages which took place between the various royal houses. Examples

[1] Append. A, IX. 23; XIII. 3; cf. the assumption of the title Φιλοκαῖσαρ by the Bosporan kings under the Empire; *C.I.G.* 2123 ff.
[2] Append. A, I. 13. [3] *ib.* [4] *ib.*
[5] Justin XXVIII. 34; Polyb. VII. 4, 5. [6] Append. *ib.*
[7] *ib.* II. 11. [8] *ib.* VII. 11.
[9] *ib.* VI. 19; cf. also IX. 18 (Cappadocian kings).
[10] *ib.* VI. 19; VII. 20.

are numerous and need not be specified. The kings rarely married below their rank, and even Herod who rose from a private station, amongst his less honourable marriage connexions, formed one with the Cappadocian house[1].

Augustus encouraged friendship among the kings[2].

§ 52. In the second place the client of Rome was not allowed to make war and peace without the consent of the senate. His foreign policy came under the senate's supervision. There are however limitations to this statement.

(b) Consent of Rome required for war and peace.

(1) The kings were generally allowed to subdue revolts within their own dependencies and put down rebel chiefs. Antiochus IV for instance, who was checked so imperiously when he attempted to secure a hold over Egypt, was allowed to subdue the Jews who had been dependent upon his predecessors[3]. Coele-Syria, also a former dependency of the Syrian kingdom, he likewise recovered with impunity, and he suppressed a revolt of his satrapy Persis[4]. Ariobarzanes III was urged by Cicero to learn his first lesson of sovereignty in preserving his own life, and securing himself against the rebels among his subjects[5]. Juba[6] and Herod[7]

Three limitations.

(1) Revolted dependencies of the king may be reduced.

[1] Jos. *Bell.* I. 25, 1.

[2] Suet. *Aug.* 48 : Reges socios etiam inter semet ipsos necessitudinibus mutuis iunxit, promptissimus affinitatis cuiusque atque amicitiae conciliator et fautor. When under the Empire Agrippa II arranged for a friendly meeting between the kings, they were quickly dismissed to their kingdoms by the nearest Roman governor (Jos. *Ant.* XIX. 338 ff.).

[3] Jos. *Ant.* XII. 236.

[4] Tac. *Hist.* V. 8 ; Jos. *Ant.* XII. 293 f.; and *v.* Append. A, VII. 11.

[5] Append. A, IX. 29. [6] *ib.* III. 38 f.

[7] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 159 ff. ; XV. 415.

enjoyed a similar liberty. Eumenes, to whom in 188 B.C. Manlius had subordinated Galatia, was not prevented from re-asserting his suzerainty by force of arms in 167 and 166 B.C., but in accordance with that arbitrariness and injustice which sometimes marred her policy, to punish Eumenes for alleged disloyalty, Rome then took it upon herself to award the Gauls their independence[1]. If it suited the senate to espouse the cause of a state in subjection to another, it was in vain to point out that the subject state could not legally establish relations with Rome or that Rome had no right to intervene when she had previously recognised the sovereignty of the superior. As however she offended the Achaeans by encouraging the secession of one of the cities of their league, after acknowledging that the internal affairs of the league were beyond her province, so she arbitrarily declared the Galatian subjects of Eumenes independent, reversing her former decision. Similarly she essayed by remonstrances to protect the Jews from the aggressions of the Syrian kings who succeeded Antiochus, though in this case it was on the assumption that the Jews had a title to freedom[2]. Not only had kings however the right to subdue their own dependencies, but they occasionally helped friends to subdue theirs, as when Eumenes helped Rhodes against the Lycians and Carians[3], and was himself succoured by Ariarathes V against the Gauls[4].

[1] Append. A, VI. 15; XII. 3. [2] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 250.

[3] Append. A, VI. 19.

[4] Ariarathes and his father had a permanent alliance with the Attalids; cf. Polyb. XXXIII. 12, Ἄτταλος...τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἀριαράθην καὶ

(2) The second limitation to the above statement that the kings did not possess the right of war, is the fact that a client king who was attacked by a neighbour could defend himself for the time being, but had to confine himself strictly to the defensive, until the senate's pleasure was known. Such a right was expressly conceded to Antiochus III in the terms of his peace[1]. Eumenes with his friend Ariarathes IV, Attalus II with Ariarathes V, did no more than defend themselves when attacked respectively by Pharnaces of Pontus, and Prusias of Bithynia[2]. Mithridates also followed the same moderate course when attacked by Nicomedes of Bithynia in 89 B.C., until the evident corruption of the Roman officer at Nicomedes' court made it clear that no redress would come from the Roman quarter. It was just the refusal to allow Carthage any right to defend herself at all, that so degraded her at the expense of Masinissa.

(2) *Defensive warfare against unprovoked attacks.*

(3) A third facility the kings enjoyed was the right to extend their conquests in certain directions, if Rome did not feel herself concerned to prevent them. This liberty was obviously enjoyed only by those kings who were not surrounded on every side by friends of Rome. Antiochus IV for example attacked the inner states of Asia, as Parthia; Attalus II assumed the offensive against the Thracian chief Diegylis who had attacked his possessions; and Bogud waged war against the Ethiopians[3].

(3) *Rome's lack of interest.*

§ **53.** There are two resolutions extant in which

τὸν Μιθριδάτην ἐξαπεσταλκότων αὐτῷ στρατιὰν ἱππέων καὶ πεζῶν κατὰ τὴν συμμαχίαν, ὧν ἡγεῖτο Δημήτριος Ἀριαράθου.

[1] Append. A, VII. 1–2. [2] *ib.* VI. 13, 22 f.

[3] *ib.* VII. 11; VI. 26; IV. 8.

the authority claimed by Rome to stop any aggression of a client king even against strangers is clearly seen. The first case is that of the special law which gave Masinissa freedom from supervision, and power to extend his borders by war against the native tribes, privileges which were evidently regarded as exceptional[1]. The peoples, against whom Masinissa then warred in his own right, had no appeal to Rome. This law did not embrace Carthage, but only, as we said, the native tribes in the neighbourhood; otherwise Carthage too would have been debarred from appealing to Rome.

Kings forbidden to cross in arms from Asia into Europe.

The second case is a special prohibition which the senate issued to the effect that no king should cross in arms from Asia to Europe. In the treaty with Antiochus III, one of the terms forbids Antiochus to wage war against any of the islands or peoples in Asia[2], but the general prohibition is found in Appian[3], where it is said to have been ignored by Mithridates. That no Asiatic power should set foot in Europe, is an extension of the previous principle laid down and successfully maintained by the senate, that no foreign power should set foot on the soil of Italy.

Client kings as defenders of the frontiers.

In connexion with the above limited facilities which the kings enjoyed of extending their conquests, we may also add that kings were sometimes expressly entrusted with the duty of keeping peace upon their borders and repelling attacks from robbers or tribes not included in the sphere of Rome's suzerainty. This practice was especially followed by Caesar, but the law passed in favour of Masinissa, as mentioned above, had

[1] Append. A, III. 7. [2] Polyb. XXI. 45. [3] *Mith.* 13.

the same object. We find a general injunction given by Caesar to those who sought his friendship after Pharsalia, "to guard the province[1]," while a particular instance is that of the institution of Mithridates the Pergamene as king of the Bosporus "to secure the Roman provinces (in Asia) against the barbarian kings[2]." For this purpose Mithridates must have had the liberty to repel attacks on the spot. Cicero pleads in defence of Deiotarus of Galatia that he had never had forces large enough to attack the Roman people but only sufficient to guard his territories from raids and plundering excursions[3]. Under the Empire the kings seem to have had the defence of the frontier imposed upon them as a duty[4], but Herod at least had to seek permission from the governor of Syria even to repress robbers, if they were outside his own territory[5].

(c) Arbitration between clients.

§ **54**. Under such restrictions were the client princes allowed to make war and peace. An aggressive war waged by one friend of Rome against another was invariably checked at once by the senate's intervention, generally upon the appeal of the party that was attacked. The senate then arbitrated between the two, the strife being meanwhile suspended. Thus Masinissa, when at strife with Carthage, was ordered to send ambassadors to the senate as soon as possible, to answer the complaints of the Carthaginians, and the latter were likewise ordered to appear at the investigation[6]. Rome professed to "guarantee Carthage peace

[1] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 65.
[2] *ib.* 78. [3] Cic. *Deiot.* 22.
[4] Tac. *Ann.* IV. 4, 5. [5] Append. A, XVI. 9.
[6] Liv. XLII. 23, 24, and *v.* Append. A, III. 8–9.

not only from herself but from king Masinissa[1]." Prusias I, who attacked Eumenes II on one occasion, was compelled by Rome to make peace with him, so that Eumenes sent a crown in gratitude to the senate[2]. Attalus II, when attacked by Prusias II, forbore to make reprisals, and waited for the decision of the senate[3]. It was some time however before his enemy came to his senses, not in fact until the senate had renounced the treaty with him. The same Attalus waited for the senate's permission before he attacked Prusias II on behalf of and in conjunction with the latter's heir, Nicomedes. The war was at first stopped by envoys, but in this case, as in the one last quoted, the distance of the senate from the scene of action prevented it from clearly ascertaining the rights of the case, and those senators who were friends of Attalus and Nicomedes managed so to arrange matters that the pair obtained a free hand, while the arbitration proved abortive through the incompetence of the Roman ambassadors[4]. In the dispute between Adherbal and Jugurtha an appeal from the former procured the appointment by the senate of ten commissioners to carry out a division of the kingdom between the two claimants. Later the senate sent word that "its wishes and decision were that Adherbal and Jugurtha should cease from armed strife, and decide their controversy rather by law than by war, in a manner more worthy of Rome and of themselves[5]."

There are many other instances illustrating this insistence of the senate upon arbitration between her

[1] Liv. XL. 24, 14. [2] Append. A, VI. 12. [3] *ib.* VI. 22 f.
[4] Append. A, VIII. 6. [5] *ib.* III. 28 ff.

clients[1]. If one of the disputants rejected or ignored the arbitration, then the Romans generally renounced their connexion with him and allowed his opponent to prosecute his claims by war. When Pharnaces would not listen to reason, Eumenes and Ariarathes IV brought the war to a close and dictated the terms of peace without further interference from the senate[2]. The disobedience of Ptolemy Philometor and of Prusias II, the former in his quarrel with his brother Physcon, the latter as an aggressor against Attalus II, was followed by a renunciation of friendship on the part of the Romans. When in such cases the senate deemed it possible, and was sufficiently interested, it also sent help to the aggrieved party in order to confirm its own decision. Physcon received five ships, sufficient only for an escort[3], but Attalus was so far befriended that he received instructions to act only on the defensive until the Romans should be able to appear in his support[4]. When Adherbal was slain by Jugurtha pending the arbitration and contrary to the strict injunctions of the senate ("contra denuntiationem"), war was declared by the senate to uphold the principle of arbitration as well as to avenge the dead prince[5].

Augustus enforced this principle still more strongly, and an offence against it entailed serious consequences. Herod, accused by Syllaeus on such a count, with difficulty made his peace with his patron[6].

[1] Append. A, IX. 16, Ariarathes V and Orophernes; II. 9, the Ptolemies, Philometor and Physcon; IX. 21, X. 6, Mithridates and Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia.

[2] Polyb. XXV. 2. [3] Append. A, II. 9.

[4] Polyb. XXXIII. 12 (the senate promised *συμμαχεῖν κατὰ δύναμιν*).

[5] Append. A, III. 30. [6] Jos. *Ant.* XVI. 290 f.; XVIII. 114 f.

Roman policy in Asia.

§ 55. The task of keeping the peace between the kings and of enforcing arbitration was borne entirely by the senate, but it was not always discharged with the same strictness. When Rome's prosperity was bound up with the maintenance of a balance of power between her greatest rivals in the East, the senate, wherever it could, was very careful to suppress any strife that might offer occasion for interference to such formidable neighbours as the Syrian and Macedonian sovereigns, or lead to the undue aggrandisement of one client at the expense of the rest. Pergamum, Cappadocia, Bithynia, Pontus and Galatia were to be weighed against one another and indebted only to Rome. After 190 B.C. Rome's greatest anxiety was to prevent Syria from again exerting a paramount influence in Eastern affairs. Hence the prompt action taken against Antiochus IV in Egypt in 168 B.C., when, not content with defending himself against the aggression of Ptolemy Philometor, he had so improved upon his victory as to have almost annexed his opponent's kingdom. Antiochus had in the first place appealed to Rome, but the senate, not feeling strong enough to take action while Perseus was yet a menace, had to wait impatiently for the result of the battle of Pydna, and when that came, it was Egypt, and not Syria that needed the intervention[1]. After the death of Antiochus IV, when intestine strife made Syria too weak to be feared, the Attalid house seems to have been the most formidable. To remove as far as possible from the scope of the Pergamene rulers any opportunity for further aggrandisement,

[1] Append. A, II. 4 f.

the senate took the Gauls into friendship on the one side, so that their dealings with Eumenes became subject to arbitration, and on the other side, where the constant enmity between the Bithynian and Pergamene kings broke out from time to time, insisted on peaceful settlements and appeals to itself.

In the last century of the Republic, however, the nobles were engrossed in their own interests, and the senate's foreign policy lost strength and consistency. During the strife between the orders that followed the death of the Gracchi, the senate seems as far as possible to have avoided wars, as likely to raise influences in Rome antagonistic to its own régime. As it did all in its power to abstain from war with Jugurtha in 111 B.C., so when Mithridates, a professed client, extended his conquests to the north of the Black Sea, the senate disregarded the breach of that principle, which, as already mentioned, it had laid down a century before, that no king should cross in arms from Asia to Europe[1]. It is true that through Sulla it checked the aggression of Mithridates in Paphlagonia, but the latter's presence there was an open breach of the peace[2]. The senate's action was further weakened by the trouble of the social war and by the corruption of its magistrates. The commissioner Aquillius in 89 B.C., to whom Nicomedes had promised money for his restoration, and could make no payments, compelled the king against his will, and without the authority of the senate, to attack Mithridates[3]. Murena in 83 B.C., for the sake of a triumph, created a similar breach of the

[1] Append. A, x. 6. [2] *ib.* [3] *ib.* VIII. 16 f.

peace no less inopportune for the senate. In Africa before the outbreak of the civil war in 49 B.C. the absence of the old well-defined policy of arbitration is seen in the fact that the kings of Mauretania and Numidia were engaged in the fiercest strife without exciting any notice from the senate[1]. The fact that these kings had not, like their predecessors, been recognised by the senate hardly explains the circumstance, but rather confirms the weakness and vagueness of the senate's later policy under the stress of civil discord.

§ **56**. Even small matters of dispute between two clients of Rome came before her for arbitration, during the second century B.C. We find that the king of Cappadocia was sued by the Gauls, his neighbours, for having caused a deluge by his attempts to make a lake out of a tributary of the Euphrates[2]. For the damage caused to their territory the senate made him pay the Gauls three hundred talents. An extant inscription testifies to the settlement by the same body of a land dispute between the Thracian king Cotys and the town Abdera[3]. Another border dispute between Ariarathes V and the Gauls was settled by the senate's commissioners in 164 B.C.[4]

(d) Commissions of inspection.

§ **57**. During the second century B.C., the more closely to establish its supervision of the foreign relations of its clients, the senate from time to time sent commissions of inspection, which visited the courts of the various kings, watched their demeanour, and estimated their resources. Most of these commissions were sent between the years 166 and 162 B.C. The first body,

[1] Append. A, IV. 5. [2] *ib.* IX. 14 f. [3] *S.I.G.* 1^2, 303. [4] *v.* n. 1.

under the leadership of Tiberius Gracchus, went, says Polybius, "as spies[1]," "to examine the relations of the kings." Of Ariarathes they gave such a good report that his son, who succeeded him three years after, is said to have owed his instantaneous recognition to their statements[2]. They also sought to ascertain the feelings of Eumenes and Antiochus IV, the latter being naturally suspected of entertaining a grudge in consequence of his dismissal from Egypt in 168 B.C. Both kings however so disguised their feelings and received them with such kindness and humility that the ambassadors "were no better informed than when they left Rome[3]." Another commission, therefore, that of G. Sulpicius and M. Sergius, went with the same object in 164 B.C., "to interest themselves (*πολυπραγμονήσοντας*) in the relations of Eumenes and Antiochus, lest there should be some understanding between them and conspiracy against Rome[4]." C. Gallus considered it within his powers to invite complaints against Eumenes from all the chief towns in Asia, and to receive such complaints during a ten days' sitting in the very gymnasium of Pergamus itself[5]. In 162 B.C. Gnaeus Octavius with subordinates received instructions to investigate the affairs of Macedonia, to settle the dispute between Ariarathes V and the Trocmi, and thence to proceed to Syria to regulate the affairs of that kingdom[6]. The irregular and unscrupulous acts of this commission, e.g. the burning of the Syrian fleet, accomplished in accordance with specific

[1] "*κατασκόπων ἔχοντες τάξιν*," Polyb. XXXI. 5.
[2] *ib.* XXXI. 14, 4.
[3] *ib.* XXXI. 5, 6.
[4] *ib.* XXXI. 9.
[5] *ib.* XXXI. 10.
[6] *ib.* XXXI. 13.

instructions from the senate, achieved the purpose of the senate in weakening the resources of the country but cost the chief commissioner his life. The senate, satisfied with the effect upon Syria, did not trouble to avenge the death of their representative[1].

The last important commission was that of Scipio Africanus the younger, which about the year 140 B.C. made a tour round the eastern Mediterranean, "to see that the kingdoms were in proper hands[2]," and according to Diodorus, "having visited kings and peoples and renewed with them all the existing friendships, they won for their hegemony a greater measure of goodwill, so that all, kings and peoples alike, having received settlements in conformity with their wishes, sent ambassadors to Rome and praised Scipio's embassy[3]." In particular they went to Egypt, "to view the whole kingdom." They there reconciled Ptolemy Physcon to his sister, and under the guidance of the king inspected all the works and resources of the country[4].

Commissions sent for the special object of inspecting the relations of the kings towards Rome and towards one another were no longer necessary, when the kingdom of Pergamus, bequeathed to the Romans in 133 B.C., brought them into the immediate neighbourhood, and enabled them to keep a constant watch over the neighbouring peoples. The territory acquired after the destruction of Carthage gave them a similar basis in Africa. Commissions purely for the purpose of arbitration continued to be sent, as for instance before the Jugurthine war in 117 B.C.

[1] Append. A, VII. 14. [2] Polyb. fr. 76 (166). [3] Diod. XXXIII. 21.
[4] *ib.* and cf. Justin. XXXVIII. 8, 8; Plut. *Apophth.* 200 E and F.

The commissions above described were not merely embassies sent by one power to another as to an equal. They were bound up with the Roman supremacy. The work done by them in settling the relations of the kingdoms and peoples was not that of an embassy. Their other duty, to examine the attitude of the kings to Rome and to one another, did come within the scope of the ordinary diplomacy of ambassadors; yet their visits to the kings were sometimes paid in the course of a general tour of inspection from state to state, while the reception accorded them by the kings, in particular the subservience with which Antiochus IV and Ptolemy Physcon shewed them over their territories, making it their chief care to prove their loyalty to Rome, implies that these commissioners came, and were recognised as coming, from an overlord, whose right of entry into the kings' territories was undisputed.

(e) Services in war.

§ 58. By no better test can the clientship of the kings be estimated than by the services which they rendered to the Romans in war. It has been stated that the clientship was of a 'de facto' nature, and its most practical result will be found in the readiness with which those kings, whose interests were closely bound up with the Romans, volunteered their support as occasion demanded. In the third and second centuries B.C., Hiero, Masinissa and Micipsa, the Pergamene, Cappadocian and Bithynian kings, were the most zealous in this office. The advantage of so doing was in their case not far to seek, and has already been indicated in our Introduction[1]. They were small

[1] §§ 2–4.

powers situated between great and mutually hostile powers, and had much to hope from a Republic whose avowed object was the exalting of the humble, and the humiliation of the great. The Bithynian, Prusias II, it is true, for a time failed to grasp the situation, but when he saw his mistake, he surpassed all in servility of demeanour.

Egypt and Syria on the other hand, having nothing to gain and much to lose, were lukewarm, and the senate rarely invited their cooperation. According to Livy they made great professions of their readiness at the beginning of the third Macedonian war, but these, if really made, were obviously insincere, and a disguise for their own designs against one another. Rome relied upon her humbler clients, and, bent upon the isolation of Perseus, was probably quite content to see the two greater powers so preoccupied. They were still too formidable, even after Pydna, for the senate to strain their loyalty too far, and even in the first Mithridatic war, when Sulla sent Lucullus to ask aid from Ptolemy Alexander Soter, the latter, after first giving some ships, "left the alliance," says Plutarch, "and shrank from the war[1]." It was the strong position of Egypt, doubtless, which allowed him such latitude, just as it had enabled Ptolemy Philometor to despise the senate's injunctions to receive back his brother, Physcon, in 160 B.C.[2] Similarly, Mithridates was enabled by the strength of his resources and position to refuse to assist the Romans in expelling the Cappadocian usurper, when 'ordered' to do so by the senate[3]. Syria, meanwhile, was too

[1] Append. A, II. 18. [2] *ib.* II. 9. [3] *ib.* X. 8.

distracted by the quarrels of the Seleucids to be able to afford assistance to another. With the weaker clients that help, which was at first rendered from motives of interest, became afterwards a matter of necessity, as the power of Rome grew greater and nearer, and in the last century they were invited or ordered to assist as a matter of course. Such a request was made to Masinissa in the third Punic war. Appian narrates that Masinissa, offended because the senate had not communicated its plans to him beforehand, answered that he would send aid, if he saw that it was necessary; to which the senate replied that, if it were necessary, Rome would command the aid[1]. The story is inconsistent with the general attitude of Masinissa, and with his subsequent action and friendly message and summons to Scipio, but, whether true or not, it represents the changed condition of affairs. When Rome was sure of her supremacy, she rarely used the same preliminary courtesies, with which she had formerly preferred her requests. Again, according to Appian, Micipsa was 'ordered' by Fabius Maximus to send him elephants with all speed[2]. To Marius, just before the Cimbrian war, "the senate gave authority to send for help to the nations beyond the sea. So Marius sent to Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, for help[3]." This was equivalent to a command; the senate assumed that Mithridates could be put upon the same footing, when, as already mentioned, it "ordered him to help against the usurper in Cappadocia." It was altogether imperative for a king to help when a Roman general was in the neigh-

[1] App. *Lib.* 92, 105. [2] *ib. Hisp.* 67. [3] Append. A, VIII. 10.

bourhood, and in the last century in the civil wars, it became the duty of every king to help the nearest party leader or the one who seemed likely to win. Deiotarus, when upon his defence before Julius Caesar, pleaded that he had been compelled to help Pompey, as the nearest imperator[1]. Caesar, though he pardoned him, refused to accept the excuse, replying that Deiotarus "ought to have known better who was really in possession of Italy, where the senate and people of Rome were, and where was the Commonwealth." Under the Empire most of the kings were on the footing of subjects, and owed assistance as such. Plutarch shews that this stage was really reached as early as the Mithridatic wars, when Pompey, by the senate's permission, not merely requested aid but "sent word to the subject kings and dynasts to repair to him in person," with their contingents[2].

The help was generally rendered in consequence of letters from the senate[3]. Sometimes however a general was allowed to enlist volunteers from the kingdoms and cities by writing letters in which he asked for them on behalf of the Roman people. This course is twice mentioned as followed by Scipio[4]. In the last days of the Republic, generals, especially the triumvirs, took matters into their own hands. Crassus, on his expedition to Parthia, used this power to increase his fortune, exempting kings from sending contingents on the payment of money, which he kept for himself[5].

[1] Parere praesentibus imperiis ([Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 67).

[2] *Pomp.* 31 (Pompey): *μετεπέμπετο τοὺς ὑπηκόους δυνάστας καὶ βασιλεῖς ὡς ἑαυτόν.*

[3] App. *Mith.* 94. [4] App. *Lib.* 112; *Hisp.* 84. [5] Plut. *Crass.* 17.

§ 59. In theory the help rendered by the kings was voluntary throughout, nor based on any clause in their treaties or any express stipulation. It has been shewn that the introduction of the term 'ally' into the treaty sometimes took place after the king had already lent his services, as a mark of honour. It has been suggested that the recipient of this title, or the king into whose treaty it was introduced, professed himself, by the acceptance of it, ready to help in future emergencies also. But only in the case of Attalus I do we find such assistance given in accordance with a stipulation in the treaty itself, "petitum ex foedere ab Attalo est ut mille milites praestaret[1]," and, as it has been pointed out already, this treaty was only of temporary duration and did not concern his permanent relations with Rome[2]. The passages which shew that the services rendered by the client kings were of a voluntary nature, that is to say, that they were the services of an interested client to a patron, are numerous and clear. Polybius states that the Roman generals accepted Hiero's proposals for peace, "supposing that he would be of great service to them in the war[3]." No stipulation on that point appears in the treaty subsequently made with him, but nevertheless Hiero did "henceforth constantly minister to their necessities[4]." "In return for the services rendered in this war," says Appian, "Hiero was made friend and ally[5]." In the second Punic war, the senate, according to Polybius, sent to Hiero for assistance and received some troops[6]. Livy does not say that Rome asked for help but that

Help theoretically voluntary.

Services of Hiero.

[1] Liv. xxxi. 46, 3. [2] §§ 12, 35. [3] Append. A, i. 1.
[4] *ib.* i. 5. [5] *ib.* i. 7. [6] *ib.* i. 9 f.

Hiero sent, unasked, gold, corn and men, "which he urgently begged the senate not to refuse." Hiero sometimes also received a price for the corn he had supplied, as at the end of the Celtic wars[1], which again shews that this supply was not imposed upon him by an alliance. On the other hand, that the senate was in the habit of accepting from him, without compensation, voluntary contributions, appears from the reply of Hieronymus to the Roman ambassadors, in which he promised to remain loyal, "if the Romans returned to him first all the gold, which they had received from Hiero, his grandfather, and secondly, the corn, all that had been given from the beginning, and the other gifts received from him[2]."

Masinissa. Masinissa's first treaty with Scipio was one of friendship. This was followed by an engagement to cooperate, if Scipio made a campaign in Libya[3]. Thus the engagement to cooperate was distinct from the treaty of friendship and did not permanently affect his position, being limited to the second Punic war. Later, however, he rendered many services, as one whose welfare was bound up with that of his patron. During the third Macedonian war he told the senate that "two things had caused him shame, one that the senate had asked him for help by envoys instead of commanding it, the other that it had sent him money for the corn[4]."

Micipsa. Micipsa is said to have told Adherbal that "those who cherished the Roman friendship undertook much labour but were the safest of all[5]." "So far as had lain in his family's power, it had contrived ever to be at their service in every war[6]."

[1] Append. A, I. 8. [2] *ib.* I. 11. [3] *ib.* III. 1.
[4] *ib.* III. 14. [5] *ib.* III. 11. [6] *ib.*

Bocchus again was not even a 'friend' of the Romans when he first lent his services. He was thus to "earn his treaty of friendship[1]." *Bocchus.*

Perhaps no one was a more constant helper or a more interested client than Deiotarus, tetrarch of Galatia in the last century B.C. The motive for his cooperation is given by Cicero as nothing more than goodwill ('benevolentia')[2]. Because of this goodwill he "not only was an ally of the Roman commanders but led his own forces in person[3]." Cicero in his letters writes, "The goodwill and all the forces of Deiotarus I regard as ours. The other kings...are unreliable both as to their resources and their goodwill[4]." This language is hardly consistent with the existence of a special provision in a treaty. So the language of a decree of the senate in 44 B.C. implies only good clientship on the part of Deiotarus as the motive for his active cooperation: "The senate has resolved that if Deiotarus and his son shall help Cassius the proconsul with all their power, as they have frequently aided the empire of the Roman people in many wars, they will please the senate and people of the Romans; and if the other kings shall do the same, the senate and people will not forget their loyalty ('officium')[5]." We may add the following reference in Sallust to the kings in general, bearing upon the preparations of Metellus for the Jugurthine war: "By the senate's authority the allies and the Latins, the kings by their *spontaneous* contributions, *Deiotarus.*

[1] Append. A, IV. 1. [2] *ib.* XII. 10. [3] *ib.* XII. 10.
[4] *ib.* XII. 12. [5] *ib.* XII. 13.

every state, in short, with the greatest zeal, did its utmost to secure the end in view[1]."

These quotations will suffice to confirm the conclusions drawn in Part I that the terms 'alliance' and 'friendship and alliance,' which we find so freely interchanged with that of 'friendship,' do not imply that the kings were bound to assist Rome by the stipulations of a regular treaty of alliance. The assistance given was dictated by motives of interest or the fear of Rome's displeasure, and in every case was the sign of good clientship. The aid afforded by the kings was in many kinds. It rarely included heavy infantry, though Deiotarus equipped and trained infantry in the Roman manner after the style of the legionary[2]. Masinissa and Antiochus IV sent elephants[3]. Cavalry came at different times from Masinissa[4], Vocio, king of a Norican tribe[5], and Malchus, king of the Nabathaei[6], light infantry from Hiero[7], corn and money from Hiero and Masinissa[8]. Information as to the enemies' movements was also frequently expected from loyal clients, as when Antiochus of Commagene sent Cicero, proconsul of Cilicia, notice of the approach of the Parthians[9].

Duty of Rome in return.

§ 60. [10]Rome's duties to her clients in return for their services were never clearly defined. While however she generally consulted her own interests, she claimed according to Caesar that her friends and

[1] Sall. *Jug.* 43, 4.
[2] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 34.
[3] Append. A, III. 13; VII. 9.
[4] *ib.* III. 13.
[5] Caes. *B.C.* I. 18.
[6] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 1.
[7] Append. A, I. 9.
[8] *ib.* I. 8, 10; III. 13.
[9] Cic. *Fam.* XV. 1, 2; 3, 1; 4, 3.
[10] On this question see also § 89 f.

allies should never lose anything of what they already possessed, but on the contrary be exalted in influence, dignity and honour[1]. Scipio Africanus Maior, when he was trying to remove the fears, which Prusias I entertained of the Roman power, pointed out how Rome had exalted petty dynasts into kings for their loyalty[2]. Micipsa claimed that Rome's friends were the safest of all, and that while it was their duty to help in all wars, they could at any rate entrust the Republic with their safety and peace[3]. At the same time it was significant that a senate's decree of 59 B.C., which Caesar quoted in replying to Ariovistus, directed the governor of Gaul to defend the Aedui and other friends of the Roman people, " so far as he could do so with advantage to the state[4]." The senate sometimes displayed the same lukewarmness in rendering active assistance, when a client was attacked by an external enemy, as when he was expelled from his kingdom by a rival from within. It did no more for Antiochus IV, when Ptolemy VI attacked Coele Syria in 171 B.C.[5], than it did for Physcon, when he sought to regain Cyprus in 162—160 B.C. and his Egyptian kingdom later[6]. But as a rule the Roman protectorate was to the client a valuable support against external foes. Those kings especially, who attached themselves more closely to her, could always appeal to Rome in difficulties, and if they needed it, they received active assistance. Ariobarzanes I against Mithridates in 92 B.C.[7], Deiotarus and Ariobarzanes III against

[1] Caes. *B.G.* I. 43. [2] Polyb. XXI. 9, 6.
[3] Append. A, III. 11.
[4] Caes. *B.G.* I. 35 : quod commodo rei publicae facere posset.
[5] Append. A, VII. 6. [6] *ib.* II. 9, 16. [7] *ib.* IX. 21.

Pharnaces in 47 B.C.[1] received such assistance from Sulla and Caesar respectively, and when Prusias II attacked Attalus II in 154 B.C., only his submission at the eleventh hour stopped the Roman preparations for war[2]. Rome included her friends in treaties. Philip for instance was forbidden "to injure Attalus...or any other friend of Rome[3]." Hiero was specially included in the peace with Carthage in 241 B.C., and also in the peace with Philip just quoted[4]. In the second treaty of peace with Carthage Rome similarly guaranteed the integrity of Masinissa's kingdom against Carthage, and later charged the Carthaginians with a breach of this stipulation[5]. On the other hand she guaranteed Carthage peace in 181 B.C. not only from her own side but that of Masinissa[6]. Manlius imposed on the Gauls conditions of peace with Eumenes in 188 B.C.[7] The reputation of her protectorate was at least high in the eyes of the Numidian kings[8].

If help were given to a client, it resulted from a vote of the senate. Pompey refused to help Tigranes against Phraates on the plea that he had no authority[9]. Caesar however in his first consulship sent aid to kings for bribes without consulting the senate[10].

Rewards of territory to clients.

§ **61.** In the second place Rome frequently rewards her clients with additional territory. This indeed was the chief incentive to loyal service. The acceptance of such gifts at her hands was in itself an acknow-

[1] Append. A, IX. 33. [2] *ib.* VIII. 5.
[3] *ib.* VI. 4. [4] *ib.* I. 12.
[5] Liv. *Ep.* 49; Diod. XXXII. 1, 3. [6] Append. A, III. 10.
[7] *ib.* VI. 8 f. [8] *ib.* III. 5, 6, 11, 23. [9] App. *Mith.* 106.
[10] Suet. *Jul.* 28.

ledgment of clientship, since the recipients knew well that the lands were given on trust. Masinissa, while acknowledging that "his kingdom had been received, increased, and multiplied through the Roman power," professed "to be content with the usufruct of it[1]." The building up of Eumenes' kingdom was far out of proportion to his services, and necessarily entailed further services. Ariarathes V won for his successor parts of Lycaonia and Cilicia by his death on the battlefield while fighting against Aristonicus the Attalid pretender[2]. "Many were the steps," says Cicero, "climbed by Deiotarus, before his services were crowned by the title of king along with the country of Armenia[3]." In the case of Herod the services were prospective. He was made king that he might be useful against the Parthians[4].

Rome claimed however for her gifts that she could resume them at will, that they remained with the king during the senate's pleasure. Such was the reply of Manlius to Jugurtha[5], and the same principle is expressed in an extant inscription, where the senate bids a client retain some property, "dum populus senatusque Romanus vellet[6]." In accordance with this principle Greater Phrygia was taken away from the son and successor of Mithridates V at his accession[7]. Finally, knowing this custom of the senate, Hiempsal II attempted to gain the sanction of a 'foedus' for his

[1] Append. A, III. 5, 22. [2] *ib.* IX. 13. [3] *ib.* XII. 7.
[4] *ib.* XVI. 1.
[5] App. *Num.* 4 : *διδόναι Ῥωμαίους τὰς δωρεὰς ἔχειν τοῖς λαβοῦσιν, ἕως ἂν τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ δοκῇ.*
[6] *C.I.L.* II. 699 (Bruns, p. 119). [7] App. *Mith.* 11, 12, 56.

possession of some land, which Scipio had adjudicated to the Roman people, but which Hiempsal and his predecessors had been permitted to retain[1].

Internal affairs of the kings.

Kingdoms outside Roman 'imperium.'

§ 62. The kingdoms were in theory outside the Roman 'imperium.' The 'provincia' was the extent of the magistrate's authority, and the kingdoms are both expressly mentioned along with the 'provinciae,' and contrasted with them. Cicero accusing Verres describes "the grief of all the provinces, the complaints of all the free peoples, the outcries from the kingdoms[2]." 'Provinces, free states and kings' was the usual order in which he summed up the countries which owned the Roman supremacy[3]. 'Kings, tyrants, and dynasts of the province' are mentioned in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, where the last named are the petty princes whose small territories were enclosed by the province on every side[4]. The kingdoms are also referred to as being outside the whole Roman Empire. Suetonius says that "Augustus cared for the allied kings, as a body, no less than for the members and parts of the Empire," shewing that the kings were not properly regarded as parts of the Empire[5]. Cassius Dio speaks too of "all the kings and dynasts who were neighbours to the Empire of the Romans" (31 B.C.)[6].

When therefore a kingdom was subjugated, in the first place it was "reduced into the form of a province";

[1] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 58.
[2] Cic. *in Verr.* II. bk. 3, § 89.
[3] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* I. 11; II. 98; cf. Sall. *Jug.* 31.
[4] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 65. [5] Suet. *Aug.* 48. [6] Dio L. 6.

in the second, the 'imperium Romanorum' was said to be enlarged in consequence. "Nero," says Suetonius, "was not moved by the wish to increase or extend the empire;...only the kingdom of Pontus, yielded up by Polemo, and that of the Alps, on the occasion of the death of Cottius, did he reduce to the form of a province[1]."

Another fact also may be cited in confirmation, namely, that with kingdoms the 'ius postliminii' was valid according to Festus, since they ranked with 'populi liberi' and 'foederati[2].' The jurists of a later period disputed the validity, but the classification of kings among 'foederati' and 'liberi' remained.

§ **63.** In accordance with this principle a Roman magistrate was specially forbidden by laws against extortion "to enter a kingdom and leave his 'provincia,'" without the consent of the senate and people[3]. The real object of these laws was not so much perhaps to protect the kings from a magistrate's extortions as to prevent a conspiracy against the commonwealth by a magistrate who had at his back the resources of one of the kingdoms. How well founded this fear was we may judge, if we bear in mind the attempts of Caesar to gain Egypt as his province, lest one of the nobles should hold it[4], also if we remember the care of Augustus that no senator should enter Egypt without his leave, and the support that Juba I gave to the senatorial refugees in 47 B.C.

Under some such law of extortion Sulla was prose-

[1] Suet. *Nero*, 18.
[2] Fest. p. 218 b.
[3] Cic. *in Pison.* 50.
[4] Suet. *Jul.* 35.

cuted for having taken money out of the friendly kingdom of Cappadocia[1], and Gabinius, when he was acquitted on the charge of having waged war in Egypt illegally, was condemned on account of extortion and oppression[2]. The generals who received bribes or promissory notes from the kings for their services and financiers who had lent sums to a royal exchequer avoided this law. They could not collect the debt themselves, but they brought pressure to bear upon their debtor, through some magistrate, whose commission allowed his entry into the kingdom, while they left their servants, private 'procuratores,' to remind the king of the extent to which he was indebted. In this way Pompey and Brutus hoped to use Cicero, when governor of Cilicia, Pompey in order to obtain the sums promised him by the late grandfather of the reigning king of Cappadocia for his restoration and other services; Brutus to recover the money with which he had financed that monarch[3]. It was a breach of the principle upheld by the laws upon extortion, when Caesar entered Egypt in 48 B.C. with the 'fasces' or signs of his magistracy carried before him. The multitude of Alexandria raised a tumult against this disparagement of the majesty of their king[4]; Caesar could enter the kingdom as general but not as civil administrator. It was usual to lay aside the 'fasces' as Antonius did in Alexandria[5], and Germanicus in Athens[6].

[1] Plut. *Sull.* 5.

[2] App. *Syr.* 51.

[3] Cic. *Att.* VI. 1, 3.

[4] Caes. *B.C.* III. 106.

[5] App. *B.C.* V. 11: Ἀντώνιος ἐχείμαζεν ἐνταῦθα ἄνευ σημείων ἡγεμονίας...εἰθ' ὡς ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ τε ἀρχῇ καὶ βασιλευούσῃ πόλει.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* II. 53, 3: hinc ventum Athenas, foederique sociae et vetustae urbis datum ut uno lictore uteretur.

§ 64. The kings therefore, as situated outside the Roman 'imperium' and free from the control of the provincial governors, enjoyed all the privileges of the 'civitates liberae' and 'civitates foederatae.'

(a) *Kings owners of their own land.*

They were the owners of their own land, whereas the provincials enjoyed only the usufruct of theirs[1]. It was flattery on the part of the Numidian kings when they professed themselves content with the usufruct, while the real 'dominium' belonged to Rome[2]. It represented however the facts to some extent, namely, that the greater part of their territory was Rome's gift, and Rome claimed the power to resume such gifts[3]. Of the original territory however the king was master and owner. He could develop it as he liked, whether agriculturally, as Masinissa did with much distinction[4], or with cities, fortifications and great public works, as did Herod[5]. The client kings under the Empire vied with one another in building cities named after Caesar[6]. It is significant moreover that while Judaea was attached to the province of Syria, its high priest was not allowed to fortify Jerusalem, but that as soon as Julius Caesar restored to Hyrcanus his temporal power as ethnarch, he allowed him to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem and "retain it as he liked[7]." The account of Herod in Josephus shews also how freely a king could order his own revenues[8].

[1] Gaius II. 7: cf. Mommsen's note on *C.I.L.* I. 99, viz.: "it is peculiar to a 'civitas libera' to have its own land."

[2] Liv. XLV. 14, 15. [3] *v.* end of § 61. [4] App. *Lib.* 106.

[5] Jos. *Ant.* XV. 331 ff.; *Bell.* I. 407; cf. also Strabo XVII. 3, 12; *ib.* XIV. 5, 6, which describe the independence of Juba II, and Herod Archelaus respectively in this connexion.

[6] Suet. *Aug.* 60. [7] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 200. [8] Append. A, XVI. 7.

(b) King's power in his kingdom absolute.

§ 65. In the second place the client kings enjoyed complete powers of jurisdiction in their own kingdoms. Strabo speaks of dynasts, phylarchs, and priests subject to the Romans, and living "according to their ancestral laws[1]." The settlements of Pompey in Asia in 63 B.C. confirmed autonomy to the free states in Asia[2], and Caesar allowed Commius as ruler of a 'civitas immunis' to retain his own 'iura legesque[3],' a privilege which we know to have been also enjoyed by the free state of the Chians[4]. This distinction according to Dio was preserved by Augustus, who "regulated the subject communities (τὸ ὑπήκοον) according to the customs of the Romans, but allowed the federated (τὸ ἔνσπονδον) to be governed in their own ancestral manner[5]."

The power of the kings over their own citizens was complete. "To do what one wills with impunity, that is kingship," is a definition Sallust puts into the mouth of Memmius[6], and the character of the Eastern monarchy was not modified by the senate. The only cases where Roman interference against regal oppression took place, belong to the period of the Triumvirate or of the Empire, and Antony, though he at first received the complaints of some of Herod's subjects, then acknowledged Herod's independence and put to death his opponents; for "if one demanded an account from a king of the acts of his sovereignty, he would no longer be a king[7]." Rome thus professed to ignore complaints

[1] Strabo XVII. 3, 24, p. 839. [2] Dio XXXVII. 20.
[3] Caes. *B.G.* VII. 76. [4] *C.I.G.* 2222. [5] Dio LIV. 9.
[6] Sall. *Jug.* 31; cf. Cic. *pro Rab. Post.* 22, 24; Tac. *Hist.* IV. 17.
[7] Jos. *Ant.* XV. 76; cf. Hor. *Carm.* III. 1, 5; Cic. *Off.* I. 70; Suet. *Jul.* 6 on the nature of 'kingship.'

of misrule brought against client princes under the Republic[1], and Cicero urged Ariobarzanes to use 'his royal right[2].' Herod was likewise reminded that he had full power to execute his sons, as king, though he accused them before Augustus[3]. The emperors however, who looked upon the kings as subjects and took an interest in their kingdoms, departed from this principle. Augustus, as early as 29 B.C., condemned Antiochus of Commagene to death for slaying an ambassador whom his brother had sent to Rome, and thus insisted on the right of the king's subjects to communicate with himself[4]. He also not only instructed Herod the Great's successor Archelaus to rule his people mildly, but removed him when he failed to do so[5].

Even over Romans resident within their kingdoms the rulers enjoyed similar unlimited powers under the Republic. A Roman who entered a kingdom without a safe conduct, as Rabirius entered Egypt under Ptolemy XI, placed himself in the power of the king, and was in the position of a royal subject[6]. The Roman citizens in Cirta relied for safety upon the "magnitude of the Roman people[7]." Since the Roman magistrate could not enter the kingdom as civil administrator, citizens in the kingdoms were outside any Roman jurisdiction. On the other hand a king's subject, when he entered Roman territory, became liable to Roman jurisdiction. Thus

[1] We may compare the remonstrances of Scipio Maior that Rome should not interfere in the home politics of Carthage, by receiving complaints against Hannibal (Val. Max. IV. 1, 6).

[2] *Fam.* XV. 2, 7.

[3] Jos. *Ant.* XVI. 98, 104.

[4] Dio LII. 43, 1.

[5] Jos. *Ant.* XVII. 319, 342 ff.

[6] Cic. *Rab.* 22.

[7] Sall. *Jug.* 26.

Bomilcar, the servant of Jugurtha, might very properly have been tried for the murder of Massiva under ordinary circumstances; it was because he was included in the safe conduct of the king ("comes eius, qui Romam fide publica venerat"), that his trial was said to have been "magis ex aequo bonoque quam ex iure gentium." There was no infringement of Jugurtha's rights as king, but merely of international law[1].

Civil cases too between Romans and the king's subjects arising in the kingdom would go before the king's courts, unless otherwise stipulated by the 'foedus.' This much we may infer from the fact that 'civitates foederatae' were thus favoured[2], and sometimes, as, for instance, Chios, 'civitates sine foedere liberae[3].'

(c) Kings and coinage.

§ **66.** Kings also possessed the right of coinage. Mommsen says that the cessation of gold coinage in the states ruled by the 'Diadochi' cannot be ascribed to Roman influence[4], and this is apparent in the case of Parthia, since no Parthian gold coins are found of the Republican period, and yet the Parthians were certainly not during that time dependent on Rome. He thinks however that in Macedonia, since the time of King Perseus, and in those autonomous states which were under Roman influence, it cannot have happened in the natural course of things, and that Macedonia lost its gold coinage by the treaty of 197 B.C. A too close analogy, however, may be drawn here between the Republican dependent states and the kingdoms. Though they are rare, gold coins are extant of several

[1] Sall. *Jug.* 35.
[2] Marquardt, *R. Alt.* IV. 347.
[3] *C.I.G.* 2222.
[4] Momm. *Staatr.* III. 1, 711, n. 1.

kingdoms under the Republic, e.g. the Thracian chief Coson issued some gold coins in 42 B.C.; Amyntas of Galatia, when Antonius was in the East, and Micipsa, according to Müller[1], issued gold staters; also of Mithridates Eupator gold coins survive belonging to three different years, 89, 85, 76 B.C., but these were the years when he was at war with Rome. Others, however, have no year marked on them; there are also some gold coins of Mauretania. Under the Empire the Bosporan kings also coined in gold.

The gold coinage of the Ptolemies stopped, according to Mommsen, after 150 B.C.

The question whether the kings as a rule resigned the right of gold coinage is very obscure, and only inferences from the dearth of such coins are possible. The coins of Coson and Amyntas may have been issued by special permission.

Rome herself coined little in gold, owing, says Mommsen, to the preponderance of the silver standard in her coinage.

There is no doubt as to the silver and bronze coinage. Silver coins survive from Cappadocia even down to 17 A.D.[2], and from the other kingdoms there is a good supply. The Numidian kings are shewn by Müller to have had the same right[3], and the like appears too of the Mauretanian kings[4]. The absence of Judaean coins from 63—39 B.C., whereas the years before and afterwards are represented by many, has led to the inference that Judaea under Hyrcanus II was without the right of coinage. But Judaea was not a separate

[1] *Coin. of Anc. Afr.* III. pp. 16, 20.
[2] Momm. *R. M. W.* 711.
[3] Müller, *l. c.* III. pp. 7–42.
[4] *ib.* p. 95.

kingdom or ethnarchy during that time, but attached to the Roman province[1]. It is very doubtful therefore whether any king was without the right under the Republic. In the last century of the Republic the Numidian coins were based upon the Roman standards. Denarii and quinarii are extant, with Latin-Numidian inscription. Bohn infers that this alteration came in after Jugurtha's death, when the Numidian family was allowed to reign with the partial sacrifice of their right.

(d) Control of their armies.

§ **67**. The client princes under the Republic not only controlled their own military régime within their kingdoms, but frequently led the forces which Rome requested as auxiliaries. The only limitations placed on their military power are such as occur in treaties of peace, in connexion with the conquest of great kings such as Antiochus and Philip, who were forbidden to keep a fleet. The rest were not sufficiently rich in money or subjects to be formidable to Rome. The personal leadership of his forces when serving as auxiliaries was considered a sign of extra zeal in Deiotarus[2]. Deiotarus and Juba were so progressive as to introduce Roman arms, discipline, and order amongst their troops[3].

Under the Empire the 'regia auxilia' preserved their distinction from the other 'sociae cohortes[4].'

(e) Right of bequest.

§ **68**. The kings under the Republic, though their successors had to be recognised by Rome, yet had the

[1] Append. A, xvi. (Introd.). [2] Cic. *Phil.* xi. 33.

[3] Cic. *Att.* vi. 1, 14; [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 68; Momm. *R.G.* bk. v. ch. 10.

[4] Bohn, p. 73, quotes Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 8, 38; xv. 26; *Hist.* ii. 4, 76; v. 1; Vell. ii. 112.

right of bequest, and of choice of successor. This is seen in the case of Ptolemy Auletes' will, which he begged Rome not to change. Rome became guardian of the prince named in the will and kept a copy of the will itself under Pompey's care[1]. But that the king had in theory the right to make his dispositions without consulting the senate, is implied in the language of Cassius Dio, which describes Caesar's action in Alexandria. Caesar claims that as consul he has the power to assume the guardianship of Ptolemy's children and "to carry out their father's resolutions[2]." When Scipio was requested by Masinissa to superintend the division of his inheritance, Masinissa nevertheless was assumed to have himself settled who should be the heirs ("quum commune eis (sc. liberis) regnum pater reliquisset")[3]. Also the kingdoms bequeathed to Rome were entered by Rome on the strength of the will of the testator. Some stress was thus laid upon a supposed will of Ptolemy Alexander of Egypt. Attalus III however when bequeathing his kingdom to Rome inserted a statement that the will must be ratified by the legatee, presumably since in the will he left freedom to certain towns, and wished this to be secured[4]. We have seen too that the king's power to leave the kingdom to his heir is the necessary consequence of the nature of the kingship, which was hereditary, and not elective[5]. That power the Roman senate did not take away, though it did not bind itself to renew the friendship with the successor, nor salute him as king in a special decree of honour. The emperors identified

[1] Append. A, II. 27. [2] *ib.* II. 29. [3] *ib.* III. 21.
[4] *ib.* VI. 29. [5] *v.* § 41.

the question of recognition more closely with that of the will, by insisting on their right of confirming the latter[1]. But the senate did not abstain from using its influence to secure the succession of a favourite. The notorious case of Jugurtha has already been mentioned, while the diplomacy used in favour of Philip's son, Demetrius, was defeated by the machinations of Perseus.

(f) Absence from their kingdoms.

§ **69**. Kings could as a rule absent themselves from their kingdoms, but if the senate thought fit, it pointed out to the king that it was to the interest of the state, that is, the Roman state, that he should remain in his kingdom, as it did not hesitate to point out to Masinissa[2]. Kings driven from their kingdoms by rebels or external foes went to Rome at once to complain[3].

Hiero visited Rome in 237 B.C. to be present at the Ludi Romani[4]. Eumenes went to discuss the settlement of Asia in 189 B.C. and make requests on his own behalf[5], Prusias with excuses in 168 B.C.[6], and the young princes of Syria with requests in 75 B.C. (circa)[7]. Herod frequently left Judaea for the last-named object, or to shew his zeal and friendship for the emperor and his friends[8]. Suetonius states that it was a general practice of the kings under the Empire to leave their kingdoms, and pay their duty to Augustus not only at Rome, but when he was traversing the provinces[9]. The 'senatus-consultum' passed against such visits to Rome in 167

[1] Jos. *Ant.* XVII. 195. [2] Append. A, III. 17.

[3] e.g. Ptolemy Physcon, Ariarathes V, Nicomedes II, Ptolemy Auletes. *v.* Append. A, II. 9, etc.

[4] Eutrop. III. 1 f. [5] Append. A, VI. 6. [6] *ib.* VIII. 4.

[7] *ib.* VII. 26. [8] Jos. *Ant.* XVI. 21, 90, 271. [9] *Aug.* 60.

B.C. was devised for the occasion against Eumenes[1], and must have been repealed or become obsolete later, since Ptolemy Physcon and other kings came to Rome afterwards to push forward their interest with the protecting power. At the same time it was the decree of a state claiming overlordship, and only conceivable in the case of princes who had been accustomed to pay their respects and solicit favours.

Occasions of senatorial interference.

§ 70. The only occasions upon which the senate intruded upon the domestic affairs of the kings were when the kingdoms had been disturbed, or when the kingship did not seem safe, and the object of the senate was to strengthen it against outside influences. Scipio's commission in 140 B.C. was to see that the kingdoms were in proper hands, though on its journey it did much in the way of arbitration. The previous commission of Octavius to arrange the affairs of Syria had really an object affecting that kingdom's foreign policy[2]. Pompey did much work of organisation in Cappadocia in 63 B.C., but only to repair the damage of the war in the matter of destroyed cities, and to strengthen the kingdom against its neighbours. The special instructions given to Cicero in 51 B.C. were directed towards the same object, the strengthening of the kingdom of Cappadocia against Parthia, and the preservation of its kingship[3].

Evocatio.

§ 71. The summons to a king, bidding him leave his kingdom and render an account of some alleged misdemeanour, was a feature of the emperors' rule.

[1] Append. A, VI. 17. [2] *v.* § 57 *sup.* [3] Append. A, IX. 29–32.

The generals of the Republic frequently summoned kings to join them with forces, but the judicial summons was more rare. Bituitus was thus summoned in the second century B.C. 'to satisfy the senate[1],' but he was only a 'regulus.' Caesar failed to get obedience from Ariovistus, when he summoned him to a conference. Ariovistus answered in terms that claimed for himself equality: "If Caesar wishes to say anything to me, let him come to me, for neither am I in any other way his inferior, and the one who has any need must himself go to the other[2]." During the civil wars the summons was successful, whenever the Roman general had the means of compulsion. In Alexandria Caesar caused a great outcry, when he summoned the children of Ptolemy Auletes before him to submit to arbitration. The minister, Pothinus, complained of it as an attack upon the royal dignity[3]. Antony gained obedience from Cleopatra, when he summoned her to give an account for helping Brutus[4], and later also from Herod, who had been accused of misgovernment in his tetrarchy[5]. With Artavasdes of Armenia he failed, and not even a siege could make that king confess his error[6]. The 'evocatio' of Jugurtha in 112 B.C. cannot be regarded from the same standpoint as those above mentioned. In the first place he came as 'dediticius,' one who had surrendered into the general's power. Secondly, because the corruption of the general had spoiled the effect of that 'deditio,' a safe-conduct had to be granted to Jugurtha, which robbed the 'evocatio' of its essential character[7].

[1] Liv. *Ep.* 61. [2] Dio XXXVIII. 34, 4. [3] Append. A, II. 32.
[4] Plut. *Ant.* 25. [5] Append. A, XVI. 5. [6] *ib.* XIV. 12. [7] *ib.* III. 31 f.

Tribute.

§ 72. Tribute was not laid upon free states which were bound to Rome by a treaty of friendship or alliance. Thus we find in Cicero the 'tributary' states frequently contrasted with the 'allied' states[1], and Appian notes that the Mithridatic war was specially burdensome to Asia, in that the 'allied' kings, and 'the cities which had a sworn treaty with Rome,' and 'those which were tribute-free on account of alliance or special service,' had exceptionally to make contributions along with cities which were 'tributary[2].' The same contrast is preserved in another passage of Appian, in which he speaks of the tributary Greeks paying nine years' tribute in two, during the civil wars of 43—42 B.C., and then goes on to say that the kings and free peoples also suffered[3]. Further, the allied states and those which had done Rome service were specially excepted in Gaul, when Caesar reduced the country into the form of a province, and imposed upon it the payment of a definite tribute[4]. Sallust again supports Appian in classing the kings with the free peoples as those who paid their money, not in tribute to Rome, but in tribute to individual nobles[5]. *'Free States' tax-free.*

Moreover when a decree of friendship was made in favour of a member of a tributary community, he received as a privilege of Roman friendship, immunity *'Individuals tax-free as friends of Rome.'*

[1] Cic. *de imp. Pomp.* 8, salvis populi Romani sociis atque integris vectigalibus; cf. *ib.* 5, regnum Ariobarzanis quod finitimum est vestris vectigalibus; *Leg.* III. 41, quos socios respublica habeat, quos amicos, quos stipendarios. Also cf. Cic. *Balb.* 24; *Leg. Agr.* 98.

[2] App. *B.C.* I. 102. [3] *ib.* V. 6.

[4] Suet. *Caes.* 25. [5] *Jug.* 8.

from tribute to Rome as well as from taxation in his own state[1]. Now Festus classes kings with the 'populi liberi' and 'populi foederati[2].' Since therefore immunity from tribute was enjoyed not only by 'foederati,' and by those who were 'sine foedere liberi,' but was extended also to private individuals who received the title 'friend,' it may well be inferred that not only those kings whose 'foedera' remained intact, but those who were called and treated as friends without the formality of a definite treaty, enjoyed the same immunity from tribute.

Tribute belongs to conquered and provincial soil.

§ 73. This inference may be supported by other considerations. It has already been shewn that the king owned his land, whereas the provincial only enjoyed the usufruct of his, the land itself being Rome's[3]. In the king's case therefore the land could not be a basis of taxation. Tribute, we find, was imposed only on conquered territory, and accompanied the imposition of the 'ius Romanorum,' or the reduction of the land into the form of a province. This is clear from two passages of Cicero and Tacitus respectively. According to the first, "on the provinces either a fixed tribute was imposed, which was called 'stipendiarium,' as for instance, upon the Spaniards and most of the Carthaginians, a kind of reward of victory, and an indemnity for the war; or a censorial contract was instituted, as for Asia, by the Lex Sempronia[4]." According to the other, a general of Nero boasted that he "would impose upon the conquered (the Armenians) tribute, laws, and

[1] *C.I.L.* I. 203.
[2] Fest. p. 218 b.
[3] *v.* § 64 *sup.*
[4] Cic. *Verr.* III. 6, 12.

instead of the shadow of a king, the jurisdiction of the Romans (ius Romanorum[1])."

The jurisdiction referred to here is that of the proconsul or propraetor, and it was intended that Armenia should be made a province. Tribute therefore was essentially a feature of provincial administration and not to be associated with the condition of kingdoms. These possessed all the outward signs of independence and were shewn above to be contrasted with the provinces and to lie outside the sphere of the magistrate's 'imperium[2].'

Tribute begins with the formation of a kingdom into a province.

This was not only so in theory. Velleius expressly states that Syria and Egypt were first made tributary when the kingship ceased and they became provinces[3]. In Judaea no tribute seems to have been paid to Rome during the reign of Herod. Thus it is stated by Josephus that Herod taxed for his own revenue public sales[4], and since later it is shewn that Vitellius released the Jews of Jerusalem, when no longer under a king, from taxes on fruits bought and sold[5], it appears that Herod's taxes were continued when Judaea became a province, and that Rome had not been receiving tribute during his reign. It is still more clearly indicated that the tribute began again after Herod's death when Judas of Galilee "excited the people to rebel, abusing those who should endure to pay tribute to the Romans, and after the God (Herod) suffer mortal masters[6]."

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 6, cf. *ib.* II. 56 : Commagenis Q. Servaeus praeponitur tum primum ad ius praetoris translatis.

[2] §§ 62, 64, 72.

[3] Vell. II. 37.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* XVII. 205.

[5] *ib.* XVIII. 90.

[6] Jos. *Bell.* II. 117 f.

This foreign tribute had evidently therefore been introduced afresh.

Even where a whole country became a province, special districts in it, which retained the privileges of alliance and autonomy, retained also exemption from tribute, as appears from the example of Gaul cited above from Suetonius[1]. It is significant therefore that when Caesar put the Atrebates under a king (Commius), he seems at the same time to have conferred immunity from taxation and restored to that state autonomy[2].

§ **74.** It might happen to a state that had surrendered at discretion, that until the time was ripe for making it into a province, it retained a measure of autonomy but paid a tribute as indemnity for war expenses. But this arrangement was only meant to be temporary, and in the case of kingdoms a definite arrangement was more quickly arrived at. The arrangement, which was made by the consul and ratified later by the senate, either prescribed the deposition of the king, or restored the king to his former position, perhaps with the loss of certain territory. The restoration was not a temporary one, but kept its force during the king's lifetime, if he behaved well to Rome. In all the cases known under the Republic, where kings and not chieftains are concerned, the restoration of the king is paid for only by a fixed indemnity, not by a permanent tribute. When Mithridates VI offered to Pompey to pay tribute for his kingdom, in order to avoid an unconditional surrender, his offer was refused. Hiero, Philip, Antiochus III made payments only

No instances known of tributary kings under the Republic.

[1] p. 127, n. 4. [2] Caes. *B.G.* VII. 76.

during a fixed number of years. Tigranes was fined in a fixed sum besides paying the large gratuity which Pompey divided among his army[1]. Mommsen, describing the settlement of Asia by Pompey, speaks of the "conversion of clients into subjects," and the "new property tax which all those princes, priests, and cities had to pay to Rome." But this is too general a statement, if it is meant to include the kings of Cappadocia, Galatia, Pontus, Armenia, Commagene, and others. The evidence of Appian does not go so far. That writer includes the Cappadocians among those who then became subject to Rome, along with the Bithynians, Cilicians, Palestine, Coele-Syria, Phoenice, and the inland districts towards Euphrates. "On some of these," he says, "they imposed tribute straightway, and on others later." The Cappadocians may be well included in the latter, and Appian be referring to the time of their annexation. He then says that Paphlagonia, Galatia, Phrygia, Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Ionia, Greece, Macedonia, and other parts were recovered from Mithridates, and "on the majority of them, not yet being tributary, they imposed tribute[2]." The kings of

[1] *v.* Append. A, XIV. 3 f., where the authorities are quoted.

Of Teuta, queen of Illyria, it is said in Polybius (II. 12, 3) that she "agreed to pay the tribute (*φόρους*) that had been ordered." This may have been a regular tribute, for it was being paid by her successor about twelve years afterwards, and had apparently fallen into arrears (Livy XXII. 33, 5). But it is possible too that an indemnity is here meant, and that, as Antiochus IV of Syria was paying off the last instalment of his father's indemnity after the lapse of twelve years, so the payments in this case extended over the same period or even longer. In any case Teuta ranks rather with tribal chiefs, than with important rulers of kingdoms, and need not therefore be treated as an example bearing upon our inquiry.

[2] App. *Mith.* 118.

Paphlagonia and Galatia from what we know of the other districts may well be excepted in the minority. The circumstances of the Cappadocian and Galatian kings confirm this conclusion.

In all the references to the finances of Ariobarzanes III there is no mention of tribute to Rome, even where such mention could hardly have been avoided, had the tribute existed. Cicero, as proconsul of Cilicia entrusted with the safety of Ariobarzanes, writes of the large sums which that king owed to Pompey and Brutus, of the poverty and insolvency of the king, and of the impossibility of squeezing money out of him for his creditors, but he never mentions tribute owed to Rome. He also speaks of the king's attempt to raise revenue on the method followed by a certain Roman provincial governor, but in connexion with its failure he discusses only the loss of Pompey and Brutus, not that of the Roman treasury[1].

Many references are made to the contributions of Deiotarus to the members of the first triumvirate, especially to Caesar, but these contributions are evidently irregular, depending on the caprice of the general, or the generosity of the king, who at first made them as presents. They were not fixed by agreement or due to the Roman state[2].

Again, Caesar, when the kings and princes flocked to him to swear loyalty after the battle of Pharsalia, dismissed them without imposing on them any other condition than that of protecting the Roman provinces[3].

[1] Append. A, IX. 37. [2] *v.* § 77 *inf.*

[3] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 65 : condicionibus impositis provinciae tuendae ac defendendae.

Josephus, though frequently describing the finances of Herod, makes no mention of tribute to Rome or to the emperor[1], for the bribes of Herod to Antony and Augustus in the shape of contributions of money or crowns cannot be regarded as tribute in the proper sense. Nor does any mention of tribute occur in the account of his institution as king[2]. Ptolemy XI of Egypt and Artavasdes of Armenia, and the kings and princes generally are also only mentioned as contributing to the war-chests of various generals, but not as owing a regular tribute to Rome[3]. The money paid by kings to individuals who secured them titles of honour or support in war, is obviously excluded from consideration as a source of public revenue[4].

§ 75. Even after the Mithridatic and civil wars therefore we do not find that the kings of Asia paid a regular tribute. Nor is it anywhere mentioned that the kings of Africa lay under such an obligation. The chieftains of Spain and Gaul on the contrary were not, and could not be, on the same footing. These tribal chiefs were rather leaders than rulers of their peoples, and the tribute imposed was not personal to the chief, as that imposed on the absolute monarchs of Africa and Asia would have been[5]. The tribes still elected

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xv. 365; xvii. 204 f., 307 f., 318 f.; *Bell.* ii. 97 f. The fourth passage describes the revenues of each of Herod's sons, without any mention of tribute to Rome, which would have materially lessened them.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 386 f.

[3] *v.* § 76 *inf.* [4] *ib.*

[5] Liv. xxviii. 34, 11 speaks of tribute being imposed on the Spanish chief Mandonius. In xxix. 3, 5 the further imposition of tribute is described in the very paragraph that speaks of the capital punishment of Mandonius and the other chiefs.

chieftains even after their country became a Roman province.

Judaea not tributary except as a republic.

Judaea after Pompey's settlement was not a kingdom. Hyrcanus was not allowed the title of king nor even of ethnarch till later, for the country was largely under the control of the Syrian governor, and Josephus distinctly calls the government an aristocracy[1]. Hence the inscriptions speak consistently of the tribute as payment imposed upon the people and not upon the high priest[2]. The case of Judaea therefore is not that of a tributary kingdom. Under Herod the tribute to Rome seems to have ceased, as has already been mentioned.

§ **76.** A passage of Appian after stating the heavy exactions made by Antony from kings and cities says that he also set up certain kings upon condition of paying fixed tributes[3]. Antony, however, did many irregular acts, which were contrary to Roman custom, and these do not affect the main question. So far as Herod is concerned, the passage seems to shew that he paid tribute to Antony for additional tracts of territory, Idumea and Samaria, whereas his kingdom proper, Judaea, had been given to him by the senate free of tribute on the joint motion of Antony and Augustus[4].

[1] Append. A, xvi. Introd. (c). [2] *ib.* (b).

[3] App. *B.C.* v. 75.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 384, *Bell.* i. 284 f., shew that Herod was made king of Judaea; from the fact that Pompey in 63 B.C. took away from Judaea all its late acquisitions of territory (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 76), and that Herod put a procurator in Idumea in 37 B.C. (*ib.* xv. 254), Bohn infers that Idumea was given to him by Antony. For in xiv. 209, it is shewn that Idumea had not been restored to Judaea until Herod's accession as king.

Examples under the Empire so far from pointing back to an existing practice under the Republic of imposing tribute upon kings, do not indicate the practice as common even under the Empire. For of the two references extant, while one shews that the Bosporan kings paid tribute[1], the other shews that Armenia was exempt from it[2]. The Bosporan kings moreover were upon a different footing from the rest, for they were allowed to bear the title *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων* and to coin in gold.

Irregular contributions.

§ **77.** The kings, however, though not paying regular tribute, made for various purposes frequent contributions which lost their voluntary nature under the late Republic.

Hiero sent sums of money on many occasions[3]. In 186 B.C. the kings and states in friendship with Rome supplied the money for games vowed by L. Scipio in the war with Antiochus[4]. In 148 B.C. Micipsa and Mastanabal promised Scipio Africanus the younger money and arms for the Carthaginian war[5]. Pompey in 66 B.C. was empowered by the senate to collect money as well as to enrol forces, and the kings were ordered to help him in everything[6], and throughout the Mithridatic war the kings had to make frequent contributions owing to the poverty of the Roman treasury through the civil wars[7]. Ptolemy XI again supplied money to Gabinius on the pretext of military support[8], while Crassus in 54 B.C. wrote to kings for auxiliary troops but accepted money instead[9]. So too for the purposes of the civil wars the two opposing

[1] Luc. *Alex.* 57.
[2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 6.
[3] Pol. VII. 5, 7.
[4] Liv. XXXIX. 22, 8.
[5] App. *Lib.* 111.
[6] App. *Mith.* 94.
[7] App. *B.C.* I. 102.
[8] Cic. *Rab.* 34.
[9] Plut. *Crass.* 17.

leaders made great and frequent demands upon the kings. Pompey "had exacted much from all the kings, dynasts, tetrarchs, and *free peoples* of Achaia[1]." This shews the unusual nature of the exaction, if it is laid on the free peoples also. Other money, which had been promised Pompey, Caesar exacted later to the full, "not so much through knavery but because his expenses were so great[2]." He pardoned kings for giving help to Pompey, "merely taking money from them[3]." Deiotarus especially was often called upon. Cicero speaks of many such contributions by Deiotarus to Caesar[4]. This money went to defray the cost of Caesar's armies[5]. Hyrcanus the high priest ordered his minister Antipater to supply corn, arms and money to Scaurus, on his Arabian expedition[6], to Gabinius when going to Egypt[7], to Mithridates of Pergamum when collecting help for Caesar in Egypt[8]. Brutus and Cassius in Asia, and later Antony levied from the "kings, dynasts, and free peoples" contributions which are contrasted with the regular tribute of the Greeks[9]. Lastly, Herod presented Augustus with 800 talents when confirmed by him in his kingdom, and later with 300 talents to go towards his public shows and largesses[10].

These contributions therefore were at first voluntary, to secure Rome's goodwill, but in the last century of the Republic were dictated by the senate, apparently without the amount being fixed, in order to supply the

[1] Caes. *B.C.* III. 3. [2] Dio XLII. 49.
[3] *ib.* XLI. 63. [4] Deiot. 14, 24, 25.
[5] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 34: ad explicandos sumptus rei militaris.
[6] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 80. [7] *ib.* XIV. 99. [8] *ib.* XIV. 127–136.
[9] App. *B.C.* V. 6, 75. [10] Jos. *Ant.* XV. 200; XVI. 128.

expenses of wars; and finally they were dictated by the leaders of the Roman state in the civil wars, or made as presents to them in order to win their favour.

Bribes.

§ 78. There was another kind of contribution to which the kings were liable, though this did not concern the treasury of Rome, but only individuals. In the last century of the Republic the kings paid great sums to individual citizens to secure themselves against deposition or to purchase honours and titles. As early as the Jugurthan war it was an established practice, Memmius complaining "that kings and free peoples paid tribute to a few nobles[1]." Sulla set up Alexander as king of Egypt in hopes of great pecuniary remuneration to himself[2]. Cicero protests against this traffic on many occasions. The restoration of Ptolemy XI, the agrarian law of Rullus, and the sale of the royal title and of 'foedera,' which marked the tribunates of Vatinius and Clodius[3] in 59 and 58 B.C., all came beneath his censure. Plutarch and Suetonius mention the sums squeezed out of Ptolemy XI by Caesar and Pompey in return for his treaty and title[4]. His brother of Cyprus fell through lack of a little generosity to Clodius. Cicero mentions the hopes of money from Juba which caused Rullus and his party to exempt Numidia from the consequences of their agrarian measure[5], and the same hopes probably prompted the proposal to call Juba 'friend and ally[6].'

[1] Sall. *Jug.* 8. [2] App. *B.C.* I. 102.

[3] For further examples shewing the extent of the practice *v.* Append. B.

[4] Plut. *Caes.* 48; Suet. *Jul.* 54.

[5] *Leg. Agr.* II. 58: Juba...bene nummatus. [6] Caes. *B.C.* I. 6.

Ariovistus doubtless paid for his title secured through Caesar in 59 B.C.[1] The petty king of Commagene obtained the gift of a 'toga praetexta' from the same source, and probably on the same condition[2]. All the princes set up by Pompey, besides paying money to Pompey himself, were probably called upon to pay also to his allies of the triumvirate, since their establishment or extensions of power, as part of Pompey's Asiatic settlement, could only be confirmed by the support of Pompey's fellow-triumvirs. A chief of Galatia, Brogitarus, similarly obtained the royal title from Clodius[3]. Though no other particular instances of the practice are mentioned by name, it is obvious that since any petty chief, even the owner of one small town (e.g. Contoniatus)[4], could become king by a senate's decree, the scope of the dishonest tribunes was unlimited.

Bribes were also necessary during the last civil wars and the later triumvirates to appease any Roman potentate to whom the king had given offence, or before whom he was accused by his neighbours or people. Herod thus twice bribed Antony, as tetrarch and as king[5].

Crowns. § **79.** It was also an early custom of those kings who wished to shew themselves good friends of Rome, to send crowns of gold to the senate, or statues of Nike as a good omen; also to make dedications in Roman temples. Among other instances of this

[1] Caes. *B.G.* I. 35, 40, 43. [2] Append. A, XIII. 6.

[3] Cic. *Har. Resp.* 29: hunc Deiotarum...tu etiam regem appellari cum Brogitaro iubes; alter est rex iudicio senatus per nos, pecunia Brogitarus per te appellatus.

[4] Diod. XXXV. 63. [5] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 303; XV. 75.

common practice are those of Attalus I, in gratitude for help[1], and of Ariarathes V, Demetrius I, and Diodotus Tryphon when seeking for recognition[2]. Since, however, it was also customary for gifts to be sent to Roman generals (as, for instance, when they were sent to Scipio at Numantia by Attalus III[3]), and in the last century the generals could do more for the king than the senate could, these crowns came to be sent to individuals instead. Thus Machares sent one to Lucullus, asking for recognition[4], Pharnaces and many other kings simultaneously to Caesar[5], Hyrcanus to Antony[6], Cleopatra to Augustus[7], all on the pretext of complimenting those generals upon their victories[8].

Personal side of the king's relation with Rome.

Private friendships.

§ 80. Some facts are forthcoming as to the personal relations of the kings, the most noteworthy feature being the private friendships which they enjoyed with individual Romans, whom the kings sometimes respected as patrons. Deiotarus had many such connexions, namely with Cato, to whom he entrusted his children and family in virtue of his ancestral hospitium[9], Pompey[10], Caesar[11], Cicero, whose son he entertained in

[1] Liv. xxxii. 8, 9. [2] Pol. xxxii. 1 (5), 2 (6); Diod. xxxiii. 20.
[3] Cic. *Deiot.* 19. [4] Plut. *Luc.* 24.
[5] [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 70; Dio xlii. 49.
[6] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 304. [7] Dio li. 6.
[8] *ib.*; cf. also Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 34 f.; App. *Syr.* 47; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 57.
[9] Plut. *Cat. Min.* 12, 15.
[10] Cic. *Deiot.* 13: quocum erat non hospitio solum verum etiam familiaritate coniunctus.
[11] *ib.* 8.

his kingdom[1], and generally with all important Romans[2]. Juba enjoyed a 'paternum hospitium' with Pompey, because the latter had restored his father[3], and the sons and daughter of Ptolemy XI had a similar connexion with Pompey for the same reason[4]. Bogud was a close friend of Caesar[5], and lastly Herod enjoyed a private friendship with Antony and Augustus, from whom he had received his kingdom, and also later with Agrippa[6].

Honours for kings.

§ 81. The personal dignity of the kings was consulted not only by means of gifts, as already described[7], but also by means of the special entertainment accorded to them or their ambassadors in Rome (in particular in the matter of seats among the senators at the games)[8]; further by the right of sitting on the tribunal with Roman magistrates[9]. Their dignity was thus counted equal to that of a Roman magistrate, but where three sat together, the Roman claimed the seat of honour in the middle, as did Sulla in 92 B.C. between the Cappadocian king and the Parthian envoy[10]. Juba was considered extremely arrogant when he took the middle seat between Scipio and Cato, and Cato moved his seat to place Scipio in the middle[11]. This honour however of a seat near the magistrate was only granted to those kings whom the senate had recognised[12]. The

[1] Cic. *Att.* v. 17.

[2] Cic. *Deiot.* 27: cum hominibus nostris consuetudines, amicitias iungebat.

[3] Caes. *B.C.* II. 25. [4] *ib.* III. 103. [5] Suet. *Jul.* 52.

[6] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 386 f.; XV. 189 ff.; XVI. 21, 290.

[7] *v.* § 46. [8] Suet. *Claud.* 25; Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 210; Dio LXVIII. 15.

[9] Dio, *fr.* 89, 4; Sall. *Jug.* 65.

[10] Plut. *Sull.* 5. [11] *ib. Cato Min.* 37.

[12] Sall. *Jug.* 65.

senate also treated hostage princes with great kindness and honour[1].

Treatment of conquered kings.

§ 82. The life of kings was generally safe when they came into the power of Rome after a conflict. A 'regulus' like Gentius might be punished with death, or one who had done such crimes as Jugurtha and had refused to surrender. Kings, if deposed, were imprisoned in Italy, as Perseus was, but if they 'surrendered at discretion' they were sometimes restored. The Cyprian king was promised an honourable safety by Cato[2]. There was even a Roman tradition against putting to death a king who had been made captive[3]. Violations of it are noted in terms which only prove the general custom. When Dio speaks of the scourging and crucifixion of Antigonus by Antonius, he is careful to add that no other king had experienced such treatment at Roman hands[4]. Tacitus in describing the severity of Tiberius states that even Tigranes, once ruler of Lesser Armenia, when under accusation, "did not escape through his royal name the punishments meted out to citizens[5]." Antonius bound Artavasdes in silver chains, on the ground that "it was a shame for one who had been a king to be bound in chains of iron[6]."

Kings in captivity lost under the Republic their royal title, just as Perseus was told by Aemilius Paullus "to forget the name of king, now that he was conquered." Pompey granted Tigranes the title 'king

[1] Liv. XLII. 2, 9: ea merita in se (sc. Antiochum) senatus fuisse, cum Romae esset, ut pro rege, non pro obside omnibus ordinibus fuerit.

[2] Plut. *Cato Min.* 35. [3] Cornif. *ad Her.* IV. 16, 23.

[4] Dio XLIX. 22. [5] *Ann.* VI. 40. [6] Dio XLIX. 39.

of kings' before he restored him, but it is noted as being contrary to custom[1]. Under the Empire, when the emperor annexed a kingdom, he sometimes allowed the royal name to the one whom he deprived of his inheritance, as Augustus did to Antiochus Philopappus and his sons[2]. Kings who found refuge in Roman territory when expelled from their own country, retained the royal title. Thus Vonones of Parthia was guarded in Syria "manente luxu et regio nomine[3]."

Antony did more harm than anyone to the royal dignity, for he not only slew many kings[4], but also made kings of private persons of ignoble birth, as Amyntas of Galatia[5]. The senate and emperors however generally paid respect to royal blood, as has been mentioned already in the case of the Syrian succession.

The act of putting a king upon trial was as rare as 'evocatio' during the rule of the senate. "So unusual is it," says Cicero of Deiotarus, "that a king should be tried on a capital charge, that until now it has never been heard of[6]."

Kings as Roman citizens.

A special honour given to kings was the Roman citizenship. Under the Republic, says Mommsen, the citizenship required residence in or near Italy, and that was out of the question for the kings. M. Antonius Polemo (as he appears on coins), if he was the one set up by Antony[7], was the first to receive it. Under the Empire many kings bore Roman names as citizens.

[1] Dio XXXVII. 6. [2] *C.I.L.* III. 1, 552. [3] Tac. *Ann.* II. 4.
[4] Dio XLIX. 32, 5; L. 13, 7. [5] *ib.* XLIX. 32, 3.
[6] Deiot. 1. The great reverence for the royal name among the Romans may be seen too from such passages as Cic. *Leg. Man.* 24; *ib. Deiot.* 40; Suet. *Jul.* 5.
[7] App. *B.C.* V. 75.

Annexation and the bequests of Attalus, Ptolemy Apion, and Nicomedes.

Senatorial policy of abstention from annexation.

§ 83. Much stress has frequently been laid upon the hesitation displayed by Rome in acquiring territory beyond the seas[1]. This appears not only in her treatment of countries after conquest: in the settlement of Macedonia after the fall of Perseus; in the restoration of the Numidian house after the fall of Jugurtha; and of Tigranes to the throne of Armenia in 65 B.C.; also in the comparatively small share of Carthaginian land which she took to herself in 146 B.C. It appears also in her partial or total abstention from annexation when a kingdom had been bequeathed to her by testament[2] or left without a ruler through failure of the royal line. For example the eastern portions of the domains of Attalus in 133 B.C. were conceded to the neighbouring kings, and when the senate seemed to have made a mistake, at least in respect of Greater Phrygia, the revised settlement left that country practically independent[3]. Cyrene, bequeathed to Rome in 92 B.C., was made into a province only after the lapse of thirty years. No advantage was taken of the extinction of the Egyptian dynasty in 81 B.C. until three years had elapsed, when Cyprus only was annexed. Cappadocia, on two occasions left without a member of the royal line, was in either case supplied with another dynasty. Even in Syria, where Pompey abolished the monarchy, Lucullus had previously set up a fresh

[1] e.g. cf. Greenidge, *Rom. Hist.* vol. I. p. 176.

[2] For the genuineness of these wills however see § 84 *inf.*

[3] Greenidge, *Rom. Hist.* vol. I. p. 187.

representative of the Seleucids. And though Rome claimed Bithynia as soon as it was bequeathed to her by the will of Nicomedes, in this case there was not only a formidable neighbour and rival claimant whose growth it was necessary to suppress, but Roman traders and slave-dealers had even in the king's lifetime overrun the country, and, apparently counting it Roman territory, had hardly left the king any subjects to govern[1].

In some cases this abstention was due to the failure of the opposing political parties to agree upon a common policy, as in the case of Greater Phrygia[2], and of Egypt and Cyprus[3], but generally it seems to have been the consistent aim of the senate to save themselves the expense and trouble of maintaining abroad such contingents of troops as would have been necessary to protect such oversea dominions. The senate had not at its service the standing armies and the professional soldiers of the Empire. To station a legion abroad on garrison duty for a considerable number of years was contrary to the terms of the soldier's service, for the army under the Republic never really lost its character of a citizen army. Instead the auxiliaries of the neighbouring kings were expected to cope with emergencies, and thus it was that Asia was instantly lost at the sudden onset of Mithridates, and that Jugurtha was able to accomplish his aggressions without any check from Roman Africa[4]. Pompey when he made

[1] Diod. xxxvi. 1. [2] Greenidge, *R. H.* p. 186.

[3] *v.* § 49 *sup.*

[4] This, as I have been reminded, was also due to the fact that a Roman governor could not operate outside his own province under the Republic without special leave.

new provinces of Bithynia and Pontus, Syria, and in an enlarged form Cilicia, was yet careful to remove the need of legionary garrisons. To this end he strengthened Cappadocia and Commagene, assigned the eastern half of Pontus to Deiotarus, and left to Tigranes and Pharnaces respectively Armenia and the Bosporus[1]. In this way he disposed of all the outlying districts to client kings. Henceforth, when a Parthian host threatens, notice of the danger is invariably sent by the king of Commagene or of Armenia, and Cicero's bare handful of Roman troops in Cilicia in 51 B.C. would have served him only for a bodyguard, had they not been swelled by the auxiliaries of Galatia.

Occasions of annexation.

§ **84**. Of the occasions of annexation one has been already mentioned; a new king refused recognition upon his accession might fear the absorption of his kingdom[2]. Annexation could also follow conquest or a bequest by the last king of the country in Rome's favour. There are four notable instances of such bequests—those of Pergamum, Cyrene, Egypt and Cyprus, and Bithynia. If Mommsen is correct in his supposition that the testament in the third of these cases was that of Ptolemy Alexander II, and not of Alexander I[3], in every instance the testator was the last of his race, dying childless. Whether any influence was brought to bear upon the kings is doubtful. In any case, in view of the above considerations as regards the Roman policy, any proposal to procure the bequest of the above kingdoms cannot have come from the main body of the senate but rather from the Equites and

Bequest.

[1] Momms. *R. G.* bk v. ch. 4. [2] *v.* § 49.
[3] Momms. *R. G.* bk v. ch. 2 (note).

commercial classes, who sought extension of their trading facilities[1]. There is no evidence however that these royal testators yielded to influence from without. Nor is it strange that the last of a line of kings, at a loss whom to choose as his heir, should surrender his kingdom to the full control of a power which had for so long wielded an indirect sovereignty. Whether this or other considerations influenced Attalus III is unknown[2], but his act probably set the fashion and suggested the course to the other monarchs mentioned above. The enemies of Rome went so far as to dispute the genuineness of his will, but an inscription of Pergamum proves its validity[3]. Much more doubtful was the will of Ptolemy Alexander. Cicero himself said that he dared not pronounce an opinion upon it, though acknowledging that the senate's authority had gone out in its behalf[4]. It is even uncertain whether it is to be attributed to Alexander I, who died in 88 B.C., or to the second of the name who died in 81 B.C. That the former should have willed the country to Rome, when he was not the last scion of the ruling family, is, as Mommsen points out, unlikely in view of the custom followed in the cases of Pergamum, Cyrene, and Bithynia. Yet it is unlikely too that the second Alexander should have had time to meditate upon the selection of his heir, when he was slain within nineteen

Genuineness of the wills of Attalus and Ptolemy Alexander.

[1] This is supported by another fact that has been brought to my notice, viz. that in 65 B.C. Crassus, the champion of the Equites, moved a proposal to subject Egypt to tribute. Plut. *Crass.* 13; Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 17, 44.

[2] For the latest review of the situation at this time *v.* Greenidge, *Rom. Hist.* I. 176.

[3] Append. A, VI. 29.

[4] *ib.* II. 20.

days of his arrival in Egypt[1]. Further, Strabo, in giving the reasons for the deposition of the Cyprian Ptolemy in 58 B.C., does not even mention the will[2]. The existence of any real will becomes yet more doubtful when we consider the actual course of events. Sulla as master of Rome set up Alexander II in Egypt, "hoping to get money from so wealthy a king[3]." The king soon perishes, and Sulla, evidently eager for nothing but his money, makes use of a rumour about a will or more probably originates one, and makes the senate at once act upon it by sending to take the royal treasures deposited in Tyre. True to the senatorial policy of abstention he does nothing further, and later we find the party of the Optimates, as represented by Catulus and Hortensius, directly opposing further intervention, the latter even insisting on the recognition of Ptolemy Auletes. The democrats, on the contrary, remembering the attitude of their party under the leadership of the Gracchi towards the possessions of the Attalids, had after Sulla's death asserted the genuineness of the will, and tried to bring the kingdom within the scope of their agrarian scheme. Cicero, when speaking against the scheme, in view of the senate's action under Sulla, can do no more than hint at the real absence of any testament[4].

The validity of the wills of Nicomedes of Bithynia and of Ptolemy Apion of Cyrene seems not to have been disputed.

The annexed territory.

§ 85. When the inheritance of a kingdom was accepted and followed by annexation, the estates

[1] Letronne, *Inscr. de l'Égypte*, II. 20.
[2] XIV. 6, 6.
[3] Append. A, II. 19.
[4] *ib.* II. 20.

which the late king had kept for his personal enjoyment became (in addition to the royal treasures) the property of the Roman people and were leased to private contractors[1]. Though, however, Rome generally contented herself with asserting her exclusive right of ownership to the royal estates, we find frequent indications that there was nothing to prevent the whole kingdom bequeathed from being treated as Roman domain land. "Who is ignorant," says Cicero, speaking against the scheme of Rullus, "that that kingdom (Egypt) is said to have become the property of the Roman people by the will of the late king?...This man (Rullus) by his law will sell Alexandria, nay Egypt itself[2]?" The case of Bithynia receives the following comment: "That inheritance we have accepted; the kingdom of Bithynia has certainly become the property of the Roman people[3]. Is there any reason why the decemvirs should not sell all its estates, cities, waters, harbours, in fact the whole of Bithynia?" Thus though in his scheme Rullus had only scheduled the 'agri regii' of Pontus and Bithynia, Cicero implies that to the rest there was just as good a title, and lays special stress on the scope left to the commissioners in Egypt, where they were to have power to discriminate between what should be sold as Roman, and what left to the inhabitants. Tacitus again speaks of the estates "once possessed by king Apion and left to the Roman people

[1] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 50: agros Bithyniae regios quibus nunc publicani fruuntur. *Ib.* II. 51: regios agros Mithridatis. Cf. also Tac. *Ann.* XIV. 18, 2 quoted *infra* (Cyrene).

[2] Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 43.

[3] *ib.* II. 41 (publicum est populi Romani factum).

along with his kingdom[1]." Apparently therefore, though Rome might have pushed her rights of inheritance to the utmost, it was only the extreme or confiscating party of democrats to whom the possibility of such action could be ascribed. C. Gracchus set them an example when he originated the severe taxation of Asia through the 'publicani' by an arrangement which had probably until then only prevailed for the estates actually claimed as domain land. It is not as Mommsen[2] asserts, that Gracchus first established the definite principle that all the land of provincials became Roman property. The contention of Holm[3], that no such principle was as yet outlined, is supported by the words of Cicero and the action of Rullus quoted above, which shew that ideas even in 63 B.C. were unsettled on the subject. It is confirmed too by the vague use of the term 'freedom,' as applied to the condition of the people of the acquired kingdom.

Meaning of the term 'freedom' as applied to the people of the annexed country.

It might be thought that this term was correctly used of the Greeks left free by Flamininus in 197 B.C.; perhaps of the Macedonians divided into four independent districts in 167 B.C.; of the Cappadocians who were offered their 'freedom' in 93 B.C., after the death of the last Ariarathes, "according to their friendship and alliance"; finally, of Greater Phrygia, when it was taken away from the heir of Mithridates V, and its only dependence upon Rome was possibly in the form of a loose attachment to the province of Asia. We can understand it also of the Cyrenian states which

[1] *Ann.* XIV. 18, 2.
[2] *Staatsr.* III. pp. 730–1; *R. G.* bk IV. ch. 11.
[3] *Gk. H.* vol. IV. ch. 19, n. 5.

the senate "ordered to be free," and abstained from making into a province for thirty years[1].

On the other hand, when Livy's epitome[2] speaks of the seizure of Asia by Aristonicus, "whereas it had been bequeathed to the Roman people, and ought to have been free," and when the Pergamenes claimed that Attalus in dying had "left their country free," subject to the ratification of the will by Rome, little more than local independence (*δημοκρατία*, says Mommsen) can be meant,—the independence which Pergamum and probably the other cities would enjoy in the midst of a district which was to be supervised as a whole by Rome. Again, there seems to have been little doubt from the first that Cyprus was to be made into a province in 58 B.C.; yet the people there "welcomed Cato, expecting to become friends and allies of the Roman people, instead of slaves (of the king)[3]." Since Cicero calls the Sicilian states 'friends and allies,' though part of a province[4], the liberty to which this friendship and alliance was akin, was again no more than urban self-government.

The acquisition of a kingdom by conquest entailed similar treatment to that described above, Rome taking to herself the domain land, and the rest being generally left to its possessors[5]. With the organisation of these districts as provinces we have not here to deal, nor with the question what improvement the transference

[1] Append. A, II. b, 39 f. [2] Liv. *Ep.* 59. [3] Dio XXXIX. 22.

[4] *Div. in Caec.* 17; *Verr.* v. 115; cf. *ib.* II. 2, v. 83.

[5] Cf. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 51 (Pontus). So in Macedonia, 'regii agri' were Roman domain land; cf. also Mommsen, *R. G.* bk IV. ch. 11.

of government made in their condition. When a kingdom was once annexed, the romanization of the country went on apace. Twenty-one years was sufficient so to change the order of things in Numidia that Augustus forbore to instate the heir of the last king, and gave him Mauretania instead[1]. The position of a king who survived the loss of his kingdom has been noticed in a previous section[2].

Attitude of Rome and her clients to one another.

General attitude of Rome.

§ 86. Though the manifestations of the protecting power of Rome in the Mediterranean were so intermittent, her attitude towards the kingdoms with which she came into contact was fixed in one particular at least. The main feature of her expansion was a habit of claiming a permanent influence over the foreign policy of those who had opposed her unsuccessfully, whether great or small. To each of her opponents in succession, first in Italy, then in every part, she adopted a tone of superiority based on a knowledge of her own force, even before events had had time to confirm it. When once her right to dictate had been acknowledged by the victim, that right was never withdrawn. Neither the terms of peace, nor the final payment of the indemnity put an end to the connexion between conquering and conquered[3]. Whether it was so

[1] Append. A, III. 40; IV. 9. [2] *v.* § 82.

[3] This is seen in the case of the Syrian kings who succeeded Antiochus III, Append. A, VII. 3 ff.

expressed in the treaty or not, the 'majesty of Rome' was ever in practice to be henceforth observed. Those whose first contact with the Republic had been by way of friendship, were little more fortunate. The greater the intimacy of friendship, the greater the need of flattering 'the majesty.' Under the garb of this friendship, the Roman supremacy was disguised by the senate, as the superiority of the 'princeps' to the rest of the citizens was disguised by Augustus, and it might have been described in the words of the *Monumentum Ancyranum*: "From that time onward I surpassed all in dignity, but had no more power than those who were my colleagues in each office[1]." It was in 190 B.C., the year of the defeat of Antiochus, that the sound of her note became so pronounced. Until then kings and cities had gone over to her hegemony because of its mildness[2], but after this date she claimed to supervise all important affairs between states in the Mediterranean. "The Romans," said Polybius[3], "have made it plain that they are so far from repudiating or despising foreign business, however little appertaining to themselves, that on the other hand they are even indignant, if everything is not referred to them, and everything is not administrated according to their judgment." No one but Rome had the right to be proud. Cato, in speaking for Rhodes, asked the senate if they were angry that there should be someone prouder than themselves[4]. "To spare the weak and pull down the proud" became her motto, and Sulla in his overtures to Bocchus remarked that "the Roman people had

[1] *Mon. Anc.* 34.
[2] Diod. XXII. 4.
[3] Pol. XXV. 1, 3 f.
[4] Cato, *fr.* 95.

always preferred to seek friends rather than slaves, thinking it safer to command the willing than those who had to be forced[1]." 'Volentibus imperitare' represents the position which the enemies of Rome bluntly called 'servitus[2].'

General attitude of the kings.

§ 87. If Rome found it so easy to command, the kings expressed just as freely their readiness to obey. According to Livy the guardians of Ptolemy Philometor declare that they will not succour the Greeks except by will of the Roman people ('nisi ex auctoritate')[3]. Antiochus IV in 168 B.C. declared that he had "obeyed the instructions of the senate's ambassadors as the commands of gods," and when asked for help, the same king and Eumenes "guarantee to supply whatever aid Rome should impose upon them[4]." The professions of Masinissa were in the same strain. "His kingdom was not his own but belonged to the Roman people," and "he blushed to think that Rome should have asked for help instead of commanding it[5]." All these expressions are quoted from Livy, but even if we allow for some exaggeration on the part of his authorities, biassed by the conditions of a later period, other authorities shew that as early as 168 B.C. the attitude of certain kings reached the depths of servility. So great was the impression made by Rome's victory over Perseus that "there was no city," says Polybius[6], "or dynast or king that did not send an embassy at that time to congratulate the Republic," and in particular Prusias II appeared in Rome in person, where he assumed the

[1] Sall. *Jug.* 102.
[2] Sall. *fr.* 413.
[3] See however Append. A, II. 2.
[4] *ib.* VII. 7 f.
[5] *ib.* III. 5, 14.
[6] XXX. 19, 15.

garb of a freedman, and even shaved his head to make the resemblance complete[1]. Adherbal, in the speech attributed to him by Sallust, said that he had been instructed by Micipsa "to consider his kingdom only as held in trust, the jurisdiction and control of it as being in the hands of Rome[2]." Rome's task therefore of establishing her overlordship was considerably lightened by the kings themselves.

Coincidence of the Roman protectorate with Roman interests. Disinterestedness in modern protectorates.

Rome self-interested in dealing with attacks upon her clients.

§ 88. From the account in a former section of Rome's duties to her clients and the extent to which she discharged those duties, it would not incorrectly be inferred that in establishing her protectorate Rome consulted her own interests first and last[3]. The protectorate, we have pointed out, was confined to the foreign affairs of the kings and their international relations. The senate's object was at first to maintain a balance of power between the Mediterranean kingdoms, then to prevent any disturbance or war that might lead to her own supremacy being threatened by another's aggrandisement. The only altruistic motive actuating Rome is that suggested in the assertion of Adherbal, that Rome's custom was "not to suffer the

[1] Append. A, VIII. 4.

[2] *ib.* III. 22.

[3] § 60. N.B. the decree there quoted, limiting the general's action in support of the Aedui, "quoniam senatus censuisset uti quicunque Galliam provinciam obtineret, quod commodo rei publicae facere posset, Aeduos ceterosque amicos populi Romani defenderet."

kingdom of anyone to grow by crime," and in Caesar's threat that "he would not neglect the injuries done to the Aedui[1]," as though Rome were a sentinel against wrongful aggression. It would not be hard to deduce from the number of occasions upon which Rome overlooked wrongful aggression against her clients, or neglected to take decisive action, that her willingness to intervene did not spring from a sense of the 'iniuria,' and the desire to right the wrong committed, but depended upon the degree in which her own interests were affected[2].

It is hardly possible to approve of this carelessness on the part of the senate in suppressing attempts made upon the security of her clients. In the Jugurthan crisis the popular party may seem blameworthy for insisting upon the correction of Jugurtha's misdoings, and driving the senate to meddle with some "quarrel-

[1] § 60.

[2] *v.* Append. A, II. 9, Physcon aided only by Roman diplomacy, not by troops; II. 19, Alexander recognised by Sulla, but unavenged by the same; VII. 6, Antiochus IV compelled to right his own injury; VII. 14, weakening of Syria; VII. 15, murder of Antiochus V unavenged; VII. 20, promise of assistance to Alexander Balas not carried out (cf. similar promise to the Jews, § 13); VII. 21, murder of Balas, who had been recognised by Rome; VII. 28, general attitude of the senate to Syria; VIII. 8, attitude towards death of Prusias II; VIII. 17, injury to Nicomedes III 'inconvenient' to Rome; IX. 16, Ariarathes V left to recover his share of Cappadocia unaided by Rome; IX. 25, Ariobarzanes II's murder unavenged; XI. 8, Mithridates of Pergamum unavenged by Caesar; XIV. 8, Tigranes unaided by Pompey.

In this last case Pompey pleaded the necessity of a mandate from the senate. The rule by which a propraetor or proconsul was forbidden to leave his province, no doubt accounted frequently for the abstention from interference, while the senate's mandate was not easily procured owing to the distance from the scene of action. The senate however clung to diplomacy.

some tribal chiefs." But it must be remembered that the senate had expressly recognised Adherbal and his predecessors for nearly a century past; that the admission to Roman friendship had, since the time of Hiero, entailed serious and tangible effects upon the relations of the Romans towards him whom they admitted; and finally that the senate had often by its action, and by the wording of at least one treaty[1], encouraged the inference that it upheld the kings whose royal title and claim to friendship it had recognised. In that one sphere at least, therefore, the security of her friends against attack and immunity from wrongful war[2], it was Rome's duty to make some return for the advantage of being able to use her friends' services at need. It suffices to add that the senate, like the Spartans, tended to identify duty with utility[3].

On two occasions under the Republic Rome went so far as to lend troops to a king to establish his position, and in both cases the action was due to the influence of triumvirs who had been paid for their support, while in the second case, that of Herod, the object openly avowed by his supporters at Rome was to employ his services for Rome against the Parthians[4]. On one other occasion when the senate gave a commission to its general warranting a loan of troops, namely to Cicero in respect of Ariobarzanes of Cappadocia, Rome's own interest was again the leading motive, a desire to strengthen her border against an impending Parthian attack[5].

[1] Append A, VI. 3, 4.

[2] Cf. *ib.* II. 4: non placere senatui sociis regibus bellum fieri.

[3] Thuc. V. 105, 4: *τὰ μὲν ἡδέα καλὰ νομίζουσι, τὰ δὲ ξυμφέροντα δίκαια.*

[4] Append. A, II. 26; XVI. 1, 3, 4.

[5] *ib.* VIII. 27, 32.

§ 89. If Rome tended to consult her own interests when danger threatened her clients from enemies without, or from rivals and rebels within, and could refrain from assisting one whom she had recognised as king, still less did she make it her interest to see that he, whom she had recognised, justified that recognition by governing his subjects wisely and with moderation. No inquiry was made into the extravagant conduct of Attalus III, and his cruelties towards his court. Ptolemy Physcon's despotic acts, in particular the murder of his relatives, were allowed to work out their own consequences, nor was any account taken of the complaints against the administration of Prusias II, until the rebellion headed by his son troubled the peace of Asia. It has already been shewn that Rome had no concern with the subjects of a king; that the Roman conception of kingship precluded intrusion into the internal government of a kingdom; that the king was absolute in his own country, master of his subjects' lives, and owner of his territories. But when we consider that Augustus could so lightly and suddenly set aside such conceptions, hear complaints against a king[1], and even punish him with exile, we are led to seek another motive for such abstention from interference. The motive of the emperor's interference seems to have been the interest which the absolute master of an empire feels in the welfare of each and every part of it, since even the client kingdoms, save those on remote borders, as the Bosporus, owned the absolute control of the emperor, and their rulers became more and more the emperor's tenants.

Rome self-interested in neglecting the welfare of her clients' subjects.

[1] E.g. against Herod Archelaus: cf. Append. A, XIII. 7; XVI. 8.

This motive was absent in the policy of the senate. In fact the condition of Bithynia in 107 B.C. and of Cappadocia in 51 B.C. shews that the senate was even ready to surrender the welfare of peoples to individual Roman magnates or to the commercial class. The senate was not interested in a country's internal régime until it became Roman, and passed beneath a Roman magistrate.

In the Roman protectorate therefore one cannot fail to notice the absence of a force which has in modern times been very prominent in the relations of certain protectors towards their clients, the absence of a moral force, or the desire of a more highly civilized people to raise the standard of government in the less civilized dependent state, to prevent "offences against the natural laws of justice and humanity[1]," to secure the happiness of a number of human beings, and almost to enforce government in the interests of the governed. It is not our intention to point to Rome's carelessness about her client's government of his people as a defect in the character of her protectorate, so much as to call attention to the contrast with modern protectorates and the ideas of modern civilization. The civilization of the Romans was in many points inferior to that of the Hellenized kings, whose foreign affairs they controlled, and a government which allowed such oppression of its own provincial subjects, could hardly be expected to teach the kings any lessons of humanity[2]. It is how-

The protected

[1] Lee-Warner, *Protected Princes of India* (1894), pp. 191–192. This work is also the authority for the following statements in relation to the British Protectorate in India.

[2] One must dissociate the Roman people, or at least a section of it, from the policy of the government. Though the treatment of its

ever at least instructive to find that an attempt of a modern power to abstain, like the Roman senate, from intervention in the internal affairs of its client kings broke down because of the moral force mentioned above. The attempt referred to belonged to the first policy of non-intervention pursued by the British in India, of which it has been said that its advocates "forgot that India must live under the eye of modern society, which cannot tolerate oppression and corruption[1]." It therefore ensued that the protecting power assumed the right to check inhuman practices and offences against natural laws or public morality; that more than one manifesto certified the protected chiefs that their authority would not be blindly supported, if its measures proved ruinous to the country's prosperity, or the inhabitants' happiness[2]. In the case of a certain Maharajah, while the British invested him with absolute powers of life and death over his own subjects, and undertook to receive no complaints against him, the prince engaged on his part "to execute justice and promote the happiness and welfare of his people[3]." Moreover in the event of the breach of such an engagement, the British Government reserved the right not only to step in and correct such abuses, but to assume a temporary control of the state[4].

chiefs in British India.

Intervention to check oppression.

slaves is hardly compatible with a high standard of humanity amongst the people in general, I have been reminded that public opinion was frequently manifested against the senate's neglect of regal misgovernment. The popular outcry against the Jugurthan business and against the restoration of Ptolemy Auletes seems to have been the expression of a constant force of public sentiment, which often voiced itself through tribunes, but was generally helpless against the widespread corruption of the ruling class.

[1] Lee-Warner, p. 11. [2] *ib.* pp. 279, 291 ff. [3] *ib.* p. 158.

[4] *ib.* p. 156.

Intervention to check rebellion of a king's subjects.

§ 90. Perhaps it was also a sense of justice which led the English to intervene on behalf of a chief against rebellious subjects, and to uphold an authority which it has once recognised, though here again, if the chief's oppression is at the root of the outbreak, he may be called upon temporarily to surrender much of his prerogative to a British officer[1]. The Roman senate on the contrary seems not to have disliked such disturbances, as they tended to weaken the country and place it more at Rome's mercy[2]. With the same motive the senate divided kingdoms when occasion offered, whereas the British Government has intervened at times to prevent the disintegration of a client state, by setting aside clauses in a chief's testament apportioning parts of his territories to younger sons[3].

It is needless to take the comparison further or one might point out other practices, in which the modern protecting power has gone beyond the ancient, sometimes as much to its own advantage as to that of the protégé, for example, in instituting a separate jurisdiction of its own for British and European subjects resident in a protected kingdom, or in establishing cantonments of soldiers in the protected country[4]. Not only was the ancient king free from such encroachments from the side of Rome, but the whole connexion was of a far looser nature, insomuch as the protected states of Rome enjoyed international rights and privileges, and nominally preserved their entire sovereignty. Whereas

[1] Lee-Warner, p. 288 ff.
[2] E.g. in Syria; *v.* Append. A, VII.; cf. § 28 *sup.*
[3] Lee-Warner, pp. 280–288; cf. §§ 62–70 *sup.*
[4] *ib.* pp. 326 ff., 344.

it was necessary for the senate to declare war upon the disloyal Cleopatra, an Indian prince to-day may be tried and punished for misconduct by the British, and it is many years since one of them received the compliment of a declaration of war[1]. Without dwelling longer on differences between the Roman and the British protectorates, that will be apparent to all, we may add as a primal cause of the difference of treatment the fact that while the Roman client-kingdoms lay almost without exception upon the borders of the Empire, the Indian client-kingdoms are in most cases surrounded by British territory. It is significant that the only state which enjoys any large measure of independence, Nepal, is a frontier state[2].

In connexion with this same question of disinterestedness, it has been pointed out by Mr Lee-Warner that the Romans had hit upon no expedient whereby to preserve the sovereignty of the kings while at the same time conferring on the kingdoms the benefit of Roman methods, and Roman law and order; that their only substitute for absolute non-intervention was annexation; that the British on the contrary resorted at last to the plan of a divided sovereignty, or the strengthening of the royal authority by a strong executive supplied by British political agents[3]. Under the Roman pro-

[1] Dio L. 4, 6; Plut. *Ant.* 60; cf. Lee-Warner, pp. 171—5, 373.

[2] Lee-Warner, p. 370.

[3] *ib.* pp. 5, 8—10. When it is said (p. 5) that "the introduction of Roman law into the protected states of the Republic was the precursor of annexation," the term 'protected states' must not be made to include kingdoms. While a king was on the throne, no attempt was made by the senate to introduce any part of the Roman system, or prescribe for any portion of his territory.

tectorate, Numidia after its annexation was, as we have seen, so quickly transformed by the introduction of Roman civilization that Augustus could not safely restore it to the heir of the late monarch. The states in British India, on the contrary, present the phenomenon of a joint rule by British and native powers, which has allowed the development of the country and the improvement of the people's welfare to proceed in the name of the native government. English officers acting for and with the native power are the solution of the difficulty that also confronted Rome, the customs and principles of the protector being introduced into the subject state without any necessity for annexation.

NOTE.—The view of the Roman protectorate and the Senate's self-centred policy put forward in the last section is clearly enunciated by Polybius. "The Senate," he says, "wishing to break up the Egyptian kingdom by diplomatic means, agreed to the demands of the younger Ptolemy (Physcon) *for its own advantage*. For this kind of manœuvre plays a large part in the counsels of the Romans. Through the ignorance of their neighbours they increase and build up their empire by diplomacy, while at the same time they oblige and pose as the benefactors of the party that is in the wrong." (XXXI. 10 (18). 6.)

APPENDIX A.

INTERCOURSE OF THE KINGS WITH ROME'S ACTS OF CLIENTSHIP.

I. Hiero of Sicily.

Friendship, with clientship in prospect:

1. Polyb. I. 16, 5 ff.: Ἱέρων...διεπέμπετο...ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης καὶ φιλίας ποιούμενος τοὺς λόγους. οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι προσεδέξαντο, καὶ μάλιστα διὰ τὰς χορηγίας... διόπερ ὑπολαβόντες τὸν Ἱέρωνα μεγάλην εἰς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος αὑτοῖς παρέξεσθαι χρείαν ἀσμένως προσεδέξαντο τὴν φιλίαν[1].

Terms of peace:

2. Polyb. I. 16, 9: ποιησάμενοι δὲ συνθήκας ἐφ' ᾧ τὰ μὲν αἰχμάλωτα χωρὶς λύτρων ἀποδοῦναι τὸν βασιλέα Ῥωμαίοις, ἀργυρίου δὲ προσθεῖναι τάλαντα τούτοις ἑκατόν, λοιπὸν ἤδη Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν ὡς φίλοις καὶ συμμάχοις ἐχρῶντο τοῖς Συρακοσίοις.

3. Diod. XXIII. 6: καὶ συνέθεντο εἰρήνην ἔτη πεντεκαίδεκα.... Κυριεύειν (Ἱέρωνα) Συρακοσίων καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πόλεων, Ἄκρων...

4. Zon. VIII. 16, 2: renewal of the friendship 'for ever,' φιλία ἀίδιος.

Clientship, and its cause:

5. Polyb. I. 16, 10: ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς Ἱέρων ὑποστείλας ἑαυτὸν ὑπὸ τὴν Ῥωμαίων σκέπην, καὶ χορηγῶν ἀεὶ τούτοις

[1] The chapters quoted from Polybius follow the numbering of the Teubner text. The same is true of the references from Diodorus, but since the fragments of that author have been differently arranged in various Teubner editions, a list will be found on p. 231 shewing the corresponding references according to the respective arrangements of Bekker and Dindorf. Bekker's numbers have been followed in this Appendix.

εἰς τὰ κατεπείγοντα τῶν πραγμάτων, ἀδεῶς ἐβασίλευσε τῶν Συρακουσίων.

6. Diod. XXIII. 6: ὁρῶν δὲ τοὺς Συρακοσίους ἀγανακτοῦντας, πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς ὑπάτους περὶ διαλύσεως.

Hiero's services *as client*:

7. App. *Sic.* 2: Ἱέρωνα δὲ τὸν Συρακοσίων τύραννον, ἀνθ' ὧν αὐτοῖς ἐς τόνδε τὸν πόλεμον συνεπεπράχει, φίλον καὶ σύμμαχον ἔθεντο. (1st Punic war.)

8. Diod. XXV. 19: Ἱέρων δ' εἰς τὸν Κελτικὸν πόλεμον Ῥωμαίοις σῖτον ἀπέστειλε, βοηθῶν Ῥωμαίοις, οὗ καὶ τὴν τιμὴν ἔλαβε μετὰ τὴν τοῦ πολέμου κατάλυσιν. (225 B.C.)

9. Polyb. III. 75, 7: ἔπεμψαν δὲ καὶ πρὸς Ἱέρωνα περὶ βοηθείας, ὃς καὶ πεντακοσίους αὐτοῖς ἐξαπέστειλε Κρῆτας καὶ χιλίους πελτοφόρους. (218–217 B.C.)

10. Liv. XXII. 37, 3: does not say Rome asked for help but states that Hiero sent, unasked, gold, corn and men 'quae ne accipere abnuant, magno opere se patres conscriptos orare.'

Hiero helped also with a fleet, Liv. XXI. 49, 3; 50, 8.

He probably assisted Rome in the Illyrian and Gallic wars, for he received spoils from both, Liv. XXIV. 21, 9.

11. Polyb. VII. 5, 7: (sc. Hieronymus) ἔφη...ἐμμενεῖν ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις, ἐὰν αὐτῷ πρῶτον μὲν τὸ χρυσίον ἀποδῶσι πᾶν, ὃ παρ' Ἱέρωνος ἔλαβον τοῦ πάππου, δεύτερον δὲ τὸν σῖτον ἐκ παντὸς ἀποκαταστήσωσι τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δωρεάς, ἃς εἶχον παρ' ἐκείνου... Cf. 1 and 5 *sup.*

Hiero included in Rome's treaties, and Rome dictates terms on his behalf:

12. Polyb. I. 62, 8: μὴ πολεμεῖν Ἱέρωνι..., and cf.

App. *Mac.* 4: Φίλιππον μηδὲν ἐς...Ἄτταλον ἢ ἐς ἄλλον τινα Ῥωμαίων φίλον ἁμαρτάνειν.

Hiero's independence:

13. (1) Right of embassy, Liv. XXII. 37. (2) Right to make friendship, if not contrary to Roman interests, and to assist his friends, *e.g.* Egypt, Athen. V. 209 A, B; Rhodes, Polyb. V. 88, 5; Carthage, *ib.* I. 83, 1 ff. Cf. also Polyb. I. 16, 10. (3) Settled the succession without reference to Rome. (4) Autonomy in domestic affairs, *e.g.* in remission of tariffs, Polyb. V. 88, 5.

II. Egypt.

1. Ptolemy II was the first Egyptian king to make friendship with Rome. This friendship was renewed by his successors, who remained on terms of equality with Rome till 204 B.C., Dio *fr.* 41, Eutrop. II. 15, App. *Sic.* 1 (where Ptolemy II is said to have tried to reconcile Rome and Carthage), Liv. XXVII. 4, 10, Polyb. IX. 11 (44) (where Rome begs for a supply of corn, 210 B.C.), Dio *fr.* 56 (Ptol. IV tries to reconcile Rome and Philip). In 204 B.C. the guardians of Ptol. V probably renewed the friendship on the king's behalf.

2. Egypt did not yet come under Rome's protection in spite of certain traditions of late origin. Philip and Antiochus III having agreed to divide Egypt, Rome declared war on Philip, but tried to appease and restrain Antiochus by negotiation, Polyb. XVI. 27, 5. Antiochus however pressed Egypt hard and brought it to terms. Holm (IV. chap. 17, n. 2) thinks he received the Asia Minor dependencies of Egypt by secret compact. When Rome, after beating Philip, demanded the restoration of Ptolemy's territory, Antiochus was able to shew that Egypt had managed without Rome's protection. Jos. *Ant.* XII. 154; App. *Syr.* 3, 5; Polyb. XVIII. 51, 10; Liv. XXXIII. 39, 4; and cf. Holm *l.c.*

Three traditions about Egypt at this time disregard these facts:

(*a*) an embassy from Ptolemy's guardians in 200 B.C. asking for Rome's sanction to their helping Athens, Liv. XXXI. 9. Egypt was not in a position to help, since Philip was snatching her Asiatic possessions, and Antiochus III was preparing to attack her at home.

(*b*) the guardianship of the young Ptolemy by Lepidus as 'tutor,' Justin. XXX. 2, 8; Val. Max. VI. 6, 1; Tac. *Ann.* II. 67; Eckhel, *Coins* v. 123. Mommsen (Bk. III. ch. 8) accepts this tradition, and yet in the same sentence says that Egypt was unwilling to give Rome occasion for interfering in the East. Niese (Bk. X. § 11, n. 2) rejects it as legendary on the ground that (*a*) Polybius says nothing of it, though giving a detailed account (XVIII. 53), and that Livy mentions no 'tutela'; (*b*) events of the next few years are quite against it; (*c*) there is no room for it in Egyptian history, since Agathocles is the king's first guardian, then Tlepolemus, then Aristomenes; (*d*) the tradition varies in its details, in one case ascribing the 'tutela' to the case of Ptol. V, in another to that of his children, Ptol. VI and Ptol. VII. M. Lepidus was the youngest of the ambassadors who went to Egypt according to Polybius and Livy, and from the general intercourse of Rome with Egypt at this time, which resulted in Lepidus going more than once, arose the story of the special 'tutela.' (Liv. XXXI. 2, 3; XXXII. 33, 4; Polyb. XVI. 27, 5; XVIII. 1, 49, 53 give the various embassies from Rome.) The commemorative coin, moreover, representing Lepidus as 'tutor reg. s. c. pont. max.,' and as putting the diadem on the head of the boy king of Alexandria, is put down by experts to 54 B.C., and would be the outcome of the legend, made much of by his posterity.

(*c*) The offer of Ptol. V to help Rome in Aetolia in 192 B.C., refused by Rome, Liv. XXXVI. 4. This again is

unlikely, at a time when Ptolemy was bound to Antiochus III by friendship and a marriage alliance, but the offer may not have been sincere. On these traditions *v.* Niese, Bk. x. § 17, n. 1, and cf. **10** *inf.*

Ptolemy VI Philometor.

3. In 171 B.C. Ptol. VI Philometor sought to renew the friendship, Polyb. XXVIII. 1 (*τὰ φιλάνθρωπα* renewed), Diod. XXX. 2.

Beginning of clientship; Egypt 'in fide populi Romani':

4. Liv. XLIV. 19, 10: legati (sc. Ptolemaei) orabant senatum, ut opem regno regibusque *amicis* imperio ferrent. Ea merita populi Romani in Antiochum, eam apud omnes reges gentesque auctoritatem esse, ut si legatos misissent, qui denuntiarent non placere senatui sociis regibus bellum fieri, extemplo abscessurus esset (sc. Antiochus). Quod si cunctentur facere, brevi extorres regno Ptolemaeum et Cleopatram Romam venturos cum pudore quodam populi Romani.

5. Polyb. XXIX. 2: *ἡ σύγκλητος πυνθανομένη τὸν Ἀντίοχον τῆς Αἰγύπτου κύριον γεγονέναι, κατέστησε πρεσβευτὰς τόν τε πόλεμον λύσοντας...*

6. *ib.* XXIX. 27: *καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι ὅσον οὔπω καταπεπονημένην τὴν Πτολεμαίου βασιλείαν τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ διέσωσαν.*

7. Liv. XLV. 13, 7: regibus Aegypti...senatum daturum operam, ut regni sui maximum semper praesidium positum esse in fide populi Romani ducant.

Ptolemy's legates reply 'Plus eos (reges Aegypti) senatui populoque Romano quam parentibus suis, plus quam diis immortalibus debere...'

Roman settlement of Egyptian affairs; commissions sent to Alexandria:

8. Polyb. XXIX. 27, 9: οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ποπίλιον καταστησάμενοι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ παρακαλέσαντες τοὺς βασιλεῖς ὁμονοεῖν. (168 B.C.)

Commissions were also sent in the following years:

9. In 164 B.C., Liv. *Ep.* 46, 47; Zon. IX. 25, 3; Trog. Pomp. *Prol.* 34; Euseb. *Chron.* I. 161 ff. (gives date); Polyb. XXXI. 2 f. (12–14). Physcon receives a separate kingdom, viz. Libya and Cyrene.

In 162 B.C., Polyb. XXXI. 10 (18) ff.

In 160 B.C. Physcon presses his case personally at Rome, Polyb. XXXI. 10 (18). 'Alliance' broken off with Philometor, Polyb. XXXI. 20 (XXXII. 1). Physcon's unaided attempt to get Cyprus, Diod. XXXI. 44 ff.; Polyb. XXXIX. 7 (18), 6; Liv. *Ep.* 47; Zon. IX. 25, 4. In 154 B.C. Rome even sent five penteconters to escort him to Cyprus, Polyb. XXXIII. 11 (8).

Egypt under Ptol. VI never assisted Rome. The promises of Ptolemy were insincere:

10. Liv. XLII. 29, 7: (Ptolemaei) tutores et bellum adversus Antiochum parabant, quo vindicarent Coelen Syriam, et Romanis omnia pollicebantur ad Macedonicum bellum. Cf. 2 (*c*) *sup.*

Independence of Ptolemy VI:

11. Makes war, where Rome is not concerned, *e.g.* in Syria, helping Alex. Balas, Polyb. III. 5, 3; App. *Syr.* 67, 70. In Crete acts as arbitrator between Cretan towns, *Inscript. of Magnesia*, 65, and has a garrison in Itanos, *C. I. G.* Add. 2561 *b* and *I. G. Ins.* III. 466. The fear of Rome however helped to make him act moderately towards his brother when victorious (Diod. XXXI. 44), and probably forego the annexation of Syria when he seized it for Demetrius II, Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 109; Diod. XXXII. 11, XXX—XL. 19 (Supplement, Teubner).

Ptolemy VII Physcon.

Ptol. VII, who succeeded in 145 B.C., was more subservient to Rome.

Roman intervention in Alexandria at the time of his succession :

12. Josephus, *Apion.* II. 49 ff. : Θέρμου τοῦ παρὰ Ῥωμαίων πρεσβευτοῦ...παρόντος· ὁ γὰρ Φύσκων ἐπικληθεὶς Πτολεμαῖος, ἀποθανόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλομήτορος...

13. Diod. XXXIII. 21 (arrival of Scipio's commission) : κατασκεψόμενοι τὴν ὅλην βασιλείαν...

14. *ib.* : καὶ πάντες (sc. kings and peoples, including the Egyptian) ταῖς αἱρέσεσιν οἰκείως διατεθέντες ἐξαπέστειλαν πρεσβευτὰς εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ τοὺς περὶ Σκιπίωνα πρέσβεις ἐπῆνεσαν. Cf. also Justin. XXXVIII. 8, 8 ; Polyb. *fr.* 166 ; Plut. *Apophth.* 200 E and F.

Roman 'hegemony' spoken of :

15. Diod. XXXIII. 21 (the envoys with Scipio) : ὡμιληκότες δὲ βασιλεῦσι καὶ δήμοις, καὶ τὴν προυπάρχουσαν αὐτοῖς φιλίαν πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνανεωσάμενοι, πρὸς εὔνοιαν τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐπηύξησαν.

16. Physcon is on no occasion said to have sent aid to Rome, *e.g.* at Numantia. Nor did Rome help Physcon. When expelled by Cleopatra, he was not restored till 127 B.C., and then only by his own means, Liv. *Ep.* 59. He was free in his foreign policy, where Rome did not concern herself, Justin. XXXIX. 1 (action in Syria) ; Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 9.

116—88 B.C. Schisms in Egypt between Ptol. VIII Lathyrus and Ptol. IX Alexander. One of these was

called by Rome 'friend and ally,' and as client of Rome exempted from tariffs in Judaea:

17. Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 250: *ἵνα τε μηδεὶς ἀτελὴς ᾖ τῆς Ἰουδαίων χώρας ἢ τῶν λιμένων αὐτῶν ἐξάγων βασιλεὺς ἢ δῆμος, ἢ μόνος Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Ἀλεξανδρέων βασιλεὺς διὰ τὸ εἶναι σύμμαχος ἡμέτερος καὶ φίλος*[1].

18. In 86—85 B.C. Sulla sent for aid against Mithridates, but with little result, Plut. *Luc.* 2, 3.

Plut. *Luc.* 3: *ἀπέλιπε τὴν συμμαχίαν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος*[2] *πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἀποδειλιάσας.*

Roman intervention in 81 B.C. to settle the succession:

19. App. *Bell. Civ.* I. 102: *Σύλλας δὲ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον... ἐψηφίσατο βασιλεύειν Ἀλεξανδρέων, ἐρήμου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀρχῆς ἀνδρὸς οὔσης... ἐλπίσας χρηματιεῖσθαι πολλὰ ἐκ βασιλείας πολυχρύσου.*

This Alexander was slain a few days after his establishment, but Rome took no notice.

The reputed bequest of Egypt to the Romans by Ptol. Alex. (80 B.C.):

20. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 41: quis enim vestrum hoc ignorat dici, illud regnum testamento regis Alexae populi Romani esse factum? Hic ego consul populi Romani non modo nihil iudico, sed ne quod sentiam quidem profero. Magna enim mihi res non modo ad statuendum, sed etiam ad

[1] The exact date of the decree is uncertain, but it must have been in the time of the first Hyrcanus, ruler of the Jews, *i.e.* towards the end of the second century B.C. For under the second Hyrcanus there were no Syrian kings to threaten the Jews, and the decree mentions an Antiochus, son of Antiochus, oppressing Judaea. The only Antiochus answering to this description and suiting the chronology was Ant. IX Cyzicenus, king of Syria 112—96 B.C., son of Antiochus VII Sidetes. Moreover from 80 to 59 B.C. the Egyptian ruler was not recognised by Rome.

[2] Plutarch calls the king '*μειράκιον*,' antedating the reign of Ptolemy Auletes. (Letronne, *Inscr. of Egypt*, LXXXVII ff.)

dicendum videtur esse. Video qui testamentum factum esse confirmet; auctoritatem senatus exstare hereditatis aditae sentio, tum quando Alexa mortuo legatos Tyrum misimus, qui ab illo pecuniam depositam nostris recuperarent. Haec L. Philippum saepe in senatu confirmasse memoria teneo... Dicitur contra nullum esse testamentum, non oportere populum Romanum omnium regnorum appetentem videri. Cf. n. 38.

Ptolemy XI Auletes.

His recognition:

21. Cic. *Verr.* II. 76: decernat bellum Cretensibus, liberet Byzantios, regem appellet Ptolemaeum, quae vult Hortensius, omnia dicat et sentiat.

22. Dio XXXIX. 12, 1: *πολλά τισι τῶν Ῥωμαίων χρήματα τὰ μὲν οἴκοθεν, τὰ δὲ δανεισάμενος, ὅπως τήν τε ἀρχὴν βεβαιώσηται καὶ φίλος καὶ σύμμαχος ὀνομασθῇ, καταναλώκει.*

23. Sall. *Fr.* 413: Ptolemaeus pretio in dies bellum prolatans.

Recognised and restored as Rome's client:

24. Suet. *Jul.* 11: (Caesar) temptavit...ut sibi Aegyptus provincia plebiscito daretur...quod Alexandrini regem suum socium atque amicum a senatu appellatum expulerant, resque vulgo improbabatur.

25. Strabo XVII. p. 794–5: (Pompey) *τὸν Αὐλητὴν... δεξάμενος συνίστησι τῇ συγκλήτῳ καὶ διαπράττεται κάθοδον μὲν τούτῳ...*

Receives Roman bodyguard:

26. Caes. *B. C.* III. 4: Gallos Germanosque, quos ibi A. Gabinius praesidi causa apud regem Ptolomaeum reliquerat.

Rome made guardian of his heirs:

27. Caes. *B. C.* III. 108: haec uti fierent, per omnis deos perque foedera, quae Romae fecisset, eodem testamento Ptolomaeus populum Romanum obtestabatur. Tabulae testamenti unae per legatos eius Romam erant allatae, uti in aerario ponerentur—hae, cum propter publicas occupationes poni non potuissent, apud Pompeium sunt depositae —alterae eodem exemplo relictae atque obsignatae Alexandriae proferebantur. Cf. 28 f. *inf.*

Ptolemy XII.

Recognition by the senate (49 B.C.), to whom he sent help:

28. Lucan v. 58—60: En tibi...Ptolemaee...Cingere Pellaeo pressos diademate crines Permissum. (Poetical paraphrase for the process of 'calling king.')

Confirmed as king by Caesar (48 B.C.), who claimed to represent the Roman people, the executor of Ptolemy XI's will, Dio XLII. 35, 4. Enrolled as friend and ally along with his sister, *ib.* XLIII. 27, 3.

Caesar in Alexandria settled disputes as representative of a 'protecting' power:

29. Caes. *B. C.* III. 107: interim controversias regum ad populum Romanum et ad se, quod esset consul, pertinere existimans...ostendit sibi placere regem...atque eius sororem ...de controversiis iure apud se potius quam inter se armis disceptare.

30. Caes. *B. C.* III. 106: Caesar...concursum ad se fieri videt, quod fasces anteferrentur. In hoc omnis multitudo maiestatem regiam minui praedicabat.

(Contrast the practice of Antony:

App. *B. C.* v. 11: Ἀντώνιος ἐχείμαζεν (ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ) ἄνευ

σημείων ἡγεμονίας—εἶθ' ὡς ἀλλοτρίᾳ τε ἀρχῇ καὶ βασιλευούσῃ πόλει.)

31. Parties in Rome receive aid from Egypt, App. *B. C.* II. 71 (the Senatorial party); IV. 63 (Cassius and Brutus, later Octavian and Antony).

Evocatio:

32. Caes. *B. C.* III. 108: Pothinus...queri atque indignari coepit regem ad causam dicendam evocari.

33. Plut. *Ant.* 25: (Antony) ἔπεμψε πρὸς αὐτὴν (*i.e.* to Cleopatra) κελεύων εἰς Κιλικίαν ἀπαντῆσαι λόγον ὑφέξουσαν ὧν ἐνεκαλεῖτο...

Limitation of Egypt's expansion:

34. Justin. XXXIX. 5, 4: quo pacto et Syriae et Aegypti regna Romana vicinitate coartata, quae incrementa de finitimis quaerere solebant, *adempto vagandi arbitrio* vires suas in perniciem mutuam converterunt.

II A. Cyprus.

Cyprus was separated from Egypt as a kingdom in 80 B.C. but annexed by Rome in 58 B.C. Its king never secured Roman recognition.

35. Liv. *Ep.* 104: lege lata de redigenda in provinciae formam Cypro et publicanda pecunia regia, M. Catoni administratio eius rei mandata est.

36. Strabo XIV. 6, 6: ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ τελευταῖος ἄρξας Πτολεμαῖος...ἔδοξε πλημμελής τε εἶναι καὶ ἀχάριστος εἰς τοὺς εὐεργετάς, ἐκεῖνος μὲν κατελύθη. μάλιστα δ' αἴτιος τοῦ ὀλέθρου κατέστη τῷ βασιλεῖ Πόπλιος Κλαύδιος Ποῦλκερ.

37. Dio XXXIX. 22: οἱ Κύπριοι τὸν Κάτωνα οὐκ ἀκουσίως, ἅτε καὶ φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀντὶ δούλων

ἔσεσθαι προσδοκήσαντες, ἐσεδέξαντο. Cf. Cic. *Sest.* 57; App. *B. C.* II. 23.

38. Plut. *Cato Min.* 35: Κανίδιον δὲ...προπέμψας εἰς Κύπρον ἔπειθε τὸν Πτολεμαῖον ἄνευ μάχης εἴκειν, ὡς οὔτε χρημάτων οὔτε τιμῆς ἐνδεᾶ βιωσόμενον· ἱερωσύνην γὰρ αὐτῷ τῆς ἐν Πάφῳ θεοῦ δώσειν τὸν δῆμον.

ib. 36: ὁ δ' ἐν Κύπρῳ Πτολεμαῖος εὐτυχίᾳ τινὶ τοῦ Κάτωνος ἑαυτὸν φαρμάκοις ἀπέκτεινε.

II B. Cyrene.

39. Cyrene was bequeathed to Ptolemy Apion by Ptol. VII Physcon, and by Apion was bequeathed to the Roman people (96 B.C.). It was not made into a province till 30 years later.

40. Liv. *Ep.* 70: Ptolemaeus Cyrenarum rex, cui cognomen Apionis fuit, mortuus heredem populum Romanum reliquit, et eius regni civitates senatus liberas esse iussit. Cf. App. *Mith.* 121; Justin. XXXIX. 5; Eutrop. VI. 11.

41. Tac. *Ann.* XIV. 18, 2: agrorum (of Cyrene) quos regi Apioni quondam habitos et populo Romano *cum regno* relictos proximus quisque possessor invaserant.

III. Numidia.

Masinissa.

First assisted Rome as an independent ally:

1. App. *Iber.* 37: Μασσανάσσης...φιλίαν τῷ Σκιπίωνι συνθέμενος ὤμοσε συμμαχήσειν, ἂν ἐς Λιβύην στρατεύῃ.

Cause of clientship; need of protection against Carthage:

2. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 10: dum Carthaginienses incolumes fuere, iure omnia saeva patiebamur; hostes ab latere, vos amici procul.

Clientship:

(*a*) Title confirmed by Rome; his kingdom 'the gift of Rome':

3. Liv. XXX. 15, 11: (Scipio) Masinissam primum regem appellatum....

4. *ib.* XXX. 17, 10: petere ut regium nomen ceteraque Scipionis beneficia senatus decreto confirmaret.

5. *ib.* XLV. 13, 13: Masinissam meminisse se regnum a populo Romano partum auctumque et multiplicatum habere; usu regni contentum scire dominium et ius eorum, qui dederint, esse. Cf. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 8: verum ego (sc. Adherbal) iis finibus eiectus sum, quos maioribus meis populus Romanus dedit.

(*b*) Foreign policy subordinate to Roman interest:

6. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 18: Masinissa nos ita instituit, Patres Conscripti, ne quem coleremus, nisi populum Romanum, ne societates, ne foedera nova acciperemus; abunde magna praesidia nobis in vestra amicitia fore; si huic imperio fortuna mutaretur, una nobis occidendum esse. Cf. Liv. XLV. 14, 3.

7. Val. Max. VII. 2, 6: senatus...cum...eum in dilatando regno avidiorem cerneret, legem ferri iussit, qua Masinissae ab imperio populi Romani solutam libertatem tribueret. Quo facto...Mauretaniae et Numidiae ceterarumque illius tractus gentium nunquam fida pace quiescentem feritatem a valvis suis repulit.

(*c*) His disputes with Carthage submitted to Roman arbitration:

8. Liv. XLII. 23, 24: (Senate decreed) Gulussam placere ...nuntiare patri, ut de iis, de quibus Carthaginienses querantur, legatos quam primum ad senatum mittat, denuntietque Carthaginiensibus ut ad disceptandum veniant.

9. For such disputes *v.* App. *Pun.* 67 ff.; Liv. XXXIV. 62 (land dispute, 193 B.C.); Val. Max. II. 10, 4 (Scipio called in); Polyb. XXXI. 21 (XXXII. 2) (Rome's partiality as arbitrator).

(*d*) Rome guarantees Masinissa's good faith:

10. Liv. XL. 24, 14: pacemque iis (the Carthaginians) populus Romanus non ab se tantum sed ab rege etiam Masinissa praestitit. (181 B.C.)

(*e*) Services to Rome in war:

11. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 12: ego (sc. Adherbal) sic existimabam, Patres Conscripti, ut praedicantem audiveram patrem meum, qui vestram amicitiam diligenter colerent, eos multum laborem suscipere, ceterum ex omnibus maxime tutos esse. Quod in familia nostra fuit, praestitit, uti in omnibus bellis adesset vobis; nos uti per otium tuti simus, in vestra manu est.

12. Liv. XXXI. 11, 8: legati Masinissae iussi...nuntiare...bellum cum rege Philippo susceptum...peterentque ut ad illud bellum mitteret auxilia Numidarum equitum. (201 B.C.)

13. Liv. XXXII. 27, 2: equites CC et elephanti X et tritici modium CC milia ab rege Masinissa...pervenerunt. Cf. XLII. 29, 8; App. *Mac.* 11 (against Perseus 170 B.C.); *ib. Hisp.* 46, 89 (in Spain); *ib. Lib.* 94, 105 (3rd Punic war).

These services voluntary:

14. Liv. XLV. 13, 12: duas res ei rubori fuisse, unam quod rogasset eum per legatos senatus, quae ad bellum opus essent, et non imperasset, alteram, quod pecuniam ei pro frumento misisset.

Masinissa as Rome's sentinel against Carthage:

15. Liv. XLI. 22, 2: certius...quae Carthagine acta essent, ab rege rescierant quam ab ipsis Carthaginiensibus.

Obeys Rome in other matters:

16. Liv. xxx. 15, 1: cum se quidem (Masinissa) in potestate futurum imperatoris dixisset (in relation to Sophonisba).

17. Liv. xlv. 14, 3: ipsum (sc. Masinissam) relinquere regnum et Africa excedere...non esse e re publica populi Romani senatum censere.

Rome as protector:

18. Liv. *Ep.* 49: placuit...quod socio populi Romani et amico Masinissae arma intulissent (sc. Carthaginienses) ...bellum iis indici.

Rome's bounty:

19. Polyb. xxi. 21: Μασαννάσαν...*βασιλέα τῶν πλείστων μερῶν τῆς* Λιβύης *πεποιήκατε.* Cf. App. *Pun.* 106; Sall. *Jug.* 78; Liv. xxx. 44, 12; and n. 5 *sup.*

Masinissa in Rome's confidence; according to Appian offended in 149 B.C. by Rome's withholding plans of campaign:

20. App. *Lib.* 94: Μασσανάσσης δὲ ἤχθετο Ῥωμαίοις... *ὅτι τὴν* Καρχηδονίων *δύναμιν αὐτὸς ἐς γόνυ βαλὼν ἄλλους ἐώρα τῷ ἐπιγράμματι αὐτῆς ἐπιτρέχοντας τε καὶ οὐ κοινώσαντας αὐτῷ πρὶν ἐπελθεῖν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς πάλαι πολέμοις ἐποίουν.*

Masinissa's choice of successors:

21. Liv. *Ep.* 50: inter tres liberos eius (sc. Masinissae) ...P. Scipio Aemilianus, quum commune eis regnum pater reliquisset, et dividere eos arbitro Scipione iussisset, partes administrandi regni divisit. Cf. App. *Lib.* 105, 106.

Micipsa.

Clientship:

22. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 1: Micipsa, pater meus, moriens praecepit, uti regnum Numidiae tantummodo procuratione

existimarem meum, ceterum ius et imperium penes vos essent.

Foreign policy subordinate to Roman interests:

23. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 1: (Micipsa...praecepit) uti...eniterer domi militiaeque quam maximo usui esse populo Romano, vos mihi cognatorum loco, vos affinium ducerem: si ea fecissem, in vestra amicitia exercitum, divitias, munimenta regni me habiturum.

24. Sall. *Jug.* 14, 10: (after 146 B.C.) hostis nullus erat, nisi forte quem iussissetis.

24A. Services to Rome in war: App. *Hisp.* 67 (in Spain); Sall. *Jug.* 7, 2 (against Numantia); Micipsa said to have hung back from assisting against Carthage in 148 B.C., App. *Lib.* 111.

Micipsa's will; Roman influence upon the succession:

25. Liv. *Ep.* 52: Micipsa regnum tribus filiis reliquit.

26. Sall. *Jug.* 8 f.: Scipio to Jugurtha says 'potius publice quam privatim amicitiam populi Romani coleret ...ultro illi et gloriam et regnum venturum.'

To Micipsa he writes 'Nobis ob merita carus est; uti idem senatui sit et populo Romano summa ope nitemur.' The result: 'Micipsa Jugurtham *statim* adoptavit, et testamento pariter cum filiis heredem instituit.'

Adherbal and Jugurtha.

Clientship:

27. Sall. *Jug.* 25, 10: (Adherbal is alleged to have said) regno Numidiae, quod vestrum est, uti libet, consulite. Cf. *ib.* 14, 25.

For Adherbal's foreign policy *v.* 6, 11, 22, 23, *sup.*

Roman arbitration:

28. Sall. *Jug.* 16: decretum fit, ut decem legati regnum ...inter Jugurtham et Adherbalem dividerent.

29. Sall. *Jug.* 21: velle et censere (sc. senatum) eos ab armis discedere; de controversiis suis iure potius quam bello disceptare; ita seque illisque dignum fore.

30. Liv. *Ep.* 64: contra denuntiationem senatus ab eo occisus est (sc. Adherbal), et ob hoc bellum Jugurthae indictum.

'Evocatio' of Jugurtha:

31. Liv. *Ep.* 64: Jugurtha fide publica evocatus ad indicandos auctores consiliorum suorum. Cf. Sall. *Jug.* 31, 19.

32. Sall. *Jug.* 35: fit reus magis ex aequo bonoque quam ex iure gentium Bomilcar comes eius, qui Romam fide publica venerat (after the murder of Massiva).

Hiempsal II.

33. Numidia after 104 B.C., though in theory Roman territory by conquest, was restored to the house of Masinissa. Hiempsal II was however ejected by the Marian party. Pompey shortly restored him and slew the rival Hiarbas, 82 B.C., App. *B. C.* I. 62, Plut. *Mar.* 40; Sall. *fr.* I. 41; [Caes.] *Bell. Afr.* 56; Liv. *Ep.* 89; Oros. V. 21.

34. Hiempsal excepted in agrarian scheme of Rullus, Cic. *Leg. Agr.* II. 58. Services in war, App. *B. C.* I. 42.

Juba I.

Largely independent owing to the Civil wars.

Recognition of Juba opposed:

35. Caes. *B. C.* II. 25: simultas cum Curione intercedebat, quod tribunus plebis legem promulgaverat, qua lege regnum Iubae publicaverat.

36. Caes. *B. C.* I. 6 : refertur de rege Iuba, ut socius sit atque amicus. Marcellus vero passurum se in praesentia negat.

Assists exiled senate (Lucan IV. 690 ; Dio XLI. 41, 2), which recognised him as king :

37. Dio XLI. 42, 7 : Ἰόβας πρὸς μὲν τοῦ Πομπηίου τῶν τε ἄλλων τῶν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ βουλευτῶν τιμάς τε εὕρετο καὶ βασιλεὺς προσηγορεύθη· πρὸς δὲ δὴ τοῦ Καίσαρος τῶν τε ἐν τῇ πόλει αἰτίαν εἶχε καὶ πολέμιος ἀπεδείχθη.

Makes war on his own account :

38. Caes. *B. C.* II. 38 : Jubam revocatum finitimo bello et controversiis Leptitanorum.

39. App. *B. C.* IV. 54 : Cirta under 'regulus,' Masinissa, 'Ἰόβα σύμμαχος.'

Numidia was annexed by Caesar in 46 B.C., and was rapidly romanized :

40. Dio LIII. 26, 2 : ἐπείπερ ἐς τὸν τῶν Ῥωμαίων κόσμον οἱ πλείους αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν Νομάδων) ἐσεγεγράφατο.

IV. Mauretania.

Bocchus.

A client from the first :

1. Sall. *Jug.* 104 f. : (senatus) Boccho, quoniam poenitet, delicti gratiam facit. Foedus et amicitia dabuntur cum meruerit.

2. Plut. *Mar.* 32 : Βόκχος ὁ Νομὰς σύμμαχος Ῥωμαίων ἀναγεγραμμένος ἔστησεν ἐν Καπιτωλίῳ Νίκας τροπαιοφόρους καὶ παρ' αὐταῖς ἐν εἴκοσι χρυσαῖς Ἰογούρθαν ἐγχειριζόμενον ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ Σύλλᾳ.

3. Sall. *Jug.* 102: populo Romano...visum amicos quam servos quaerere; tutiusque rati volentibus quam coactis imperitare (words of Sulla to Bocchus).

4. Plut. *Sull.* 6: *τόν τε δῆμον θεραπεύων ἐν Ῥώμῃ... ἀνέθηκεν εἰκόνας.*

Successors of Bocchus.

5. In 82 B.C. Bogud, son and successor of Bocchus, was reigning, Oros. v. 21, 14. Cic. *Sull.* 56 mentions a business connexion between this king and a Roman, Sittius (cir. 65 B.C.). In 49 B.C. Mauretania was already divided between Bogud (the Western half) and Bocchus (the Eastern), Pliny, *N. H.* v. 2, 19; Strabo XVII. 3, 7. These kings were probably not at first recognised by Rome, since P. Sittius Nucerinus, a Catilinarian exile, found refuge with them, App. *B. C.* IV. 54, and their fierce civil wars received no notice from Rome (*ib.*). As in Juba's case, the first recognition of them seems to have been when their aid was needed in the civil wars.

Recognition (by Caesar):

6. Dio XLI. 42, 7: *ὅ τε Βόκχος καὶ ὁ Βογούας βασιλῆς, ὅτι ἐχθροὶ αὐτῷ* (sc. Ἰόβᾳ) *ἦσαν, ὠνομάσθησαν.*

7. Services to Caesar in war, [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 59; rewarded by Caesar, Suet. *Jul.* 52 (Bogud), App. *B. C.* IV. 54 (Bocchus).

Independent action:

8. Strabo XVII. 3, 5: *Βόγον δὲ τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Μαυρουσίων ἀναβάντα ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑσπερίους Αἰθίοπας.*

9. When Bogud was slain by Agrippa in the civil wars, Bocchus was confirmed by Augustus in possession of the whole of Mauretania. Upon his death in 33 B.C. his kingdom became a Roman province, but in 25 B.C. was given to Juba, son of Juba of Numidia, App. *B. C.* V. 26 (where Bocchus is put by mistake for Bogud), Dio XLVIII. 45; XLIX. 33.

V. Macedonia.

Philip.

1. For Philip's terms of peace with Rome *v.* Polyb. XVIII. 44; Liv. XXXIII. 30, 6; Plut. *Tit.* 9.

Philip advised to seek Rome's friendship formally[1]:

2. Liv. XXXIII. 35, 5: (Cn. Cornelius legatus) ei (sc. Philippo) suasit, quoniam pacem impetrasset, ad societatem amicitiamque petendam mitteret Romam legatos, ne, si quid Antiochus moveret, exspectasse et temporum opportunitates captasse ad rebellandum videri posset.

3. Philip maintained his independence, and never really became a client of Rome. Thus (*a*) he only aided Rome where some immediate reward was promised him or from motives of retaliation against Antiochus; *v.* Liv. XXXVI. 8, 4 ff., App. *Syr.* 16, Zon. IX. 19, 3, for the latter motive; Liv. XXXVI. 33, 1, XXXIX. 23, 10; 28, 3, for the former. For his operations along with the Romans *v.* also Liv. XXXVI. 14; 23, 6; 25; 34, 9. He did the Romans good service in the march through Thrace, but when they had crossed to Asia, he sent no contingents, and only volunteers from Macedonia are mentioned in Liv. XXXVII. 39, 12. The account in Livy XXXVII. and XXXVIII. and Polyb. XXI. and XXII. shews also among other facts that the Aetolians helped the Athamanians against Philip, while themselves at truce with Rome; that the Athamanians had been entrusted to Philip's sole disposal and yet were pardoned by Rome in spite of Philip; that the Consul negotiated with Aetolia without consulting Philip; shewing that while Philip helped Rome for hire, Rome did not hesitate to act without him, as if he were warring independently, and had no alliance or close connexion with herself.

[1] That Philip should have accepted the title 'ally' is inconsistent with the passages about to be enumerated. On Livy's terminology *v.* Part I.

(*b*) He carried on extensive wars and added to his kingdom without remonstrance from Rome. The passages quoted below shew his full right to do so, and Livy's language contradicts his account of the terms of the treaty. Moreover these wars were conducted while Philip was on trial for offences alleged against him by Rome's friends, 186–182 B.C.

Liv. XXXIX. 35, 4: interim (184 B.C.) per speciem auxilii Byzantiis ferendi, re ipsa ad terrorem regulis Thracum iniciendum profectus, perculsis iis uno proelio et Amadocum duce capto in Macedoniam rediit.

ib. 53, 12: avertendos etiam animos a suspicione talium consiliorum (of war against Rome) ratus, mediam in Thraciam exercitum...duxit. Cf. XL. 21, 1; Polyb. XXIII. 8, 3.

His foreign policy therefore is certainly not subordinated to Rome's interest.

(*c*) Even the arbitration imposed on him was not accepted by Philip as a client, but with protests against his false position, cf. Liv. XXXIX. 24, 13; 28, 13; Polyb. XXIII. 8; 9.

(*d*) Philip formed alliances with other powers than those which were friendly to Rome, *e.g.* with the Bastarnae, Liv. XL. 57, 7; Polyb. XXV. 6.

(*e*) He resists Roman influence in his choice of a successor, Polyb. XXIII. 3, 8 f.; Liv. XL. 11, 1; App. *Mac.* 9.

The formalities of friendship were however kept up between Rome and Philip, cf. Zon. IX. 19, 8 (Philip sends a crown); Plut. *Tit.* 14 (Philip voted 'ally').

Perseus.

Recognition by the senate:

4. Liv. XL. 58, 9: Perseus potitus regno...dum firmaret

res, legatos Romam ad amicitiam paternam renovandam petendumque, ut rex ab senatu appellaretur, misit.

Diod. XXIX. 33: '*τὴν πατρίαν φιλίαν.*'

Independence:

5. Maintains the alliance with the Bastarnae, Polyb. XXV. 6; forms marriage connexions with Seleucus of Syria, and Prusias of Bithynia, Polyb. XXV. 4, 8, Liv. XLII. 12, 3; friendly with Rhodes, Polyb. XXV. 4 (XXVI. 7), *C. I. G.* 2275; also with the States of Greece, being a member of the Delphian Amphictiony, *S. I. G.* I². 293; makes a treaty with the Illyrians, Liv. XLV. 33, 8. He subdued the Dolopians and helped Byzantium, Liv. XLII. 13, 8; 41, 11. Attacked Abrupolis, Liv. XLII. 41, 10, Diod. XXIX. 36, App. *Mac.* 11, 6[1]. He thus pursued his foreign policy, the chief test of clientship to Rome, quite independently of Roman interests.

VI. Pergamum.

Attalus I.

Attalus at first an ally on an equal footing:

1. Liv. XXVI. 24, 8: igitur conscriptae condiciones, quibus in amicitiam societatemque populi Romani venirent, additumque ut, si placeret vellentque, eodem iure amicitiae ...Attalus...esse(n)t. (211 B.C.)

Cf. XXIX. 11, 2: cum Attalo rege propter commune adversus Philippum bellum coeptam amicitiam esse.

2. Liv. XXXI. 46, 3: petitum ex foedere ab Attalo est, ut mille milites praestaret, tantum enim numerum bellum gerentibus adversus Philippum debebat. Liv. *ib.* 16 shews arrangements were also made about the division of booty.

[1] Rome's protest against this action was made on the ground tha Abrupolis was her friend and ally; not on the ground that Perseus had no such freedom of action under any circumstances.

These terms were probably also those of the first alliance.

For the temporary nature of this alliance *v.* Polyb. XVI. 25, where it is spoken of some years later as a '*προγεγενημένη κοινοπραγία*'; also *v.* 1 *sup.*

3. Attalus included in the Roman peace with Philip, 204 B.C., Liv. XXIX. 12, 14.

4. App. *Mac.* 4: *Φίλιππον δὲ μηδὲν ἐς...Ἄτταλον ἢ ἐς ἄλλον τινα Ῥωμαίων φίλον ἁμαρτάνειν.* (200 B.C.)

5. In the second Macedonian war the clientship is foreshadowed. Attalus appeals to the Romans, who bid Philip submit to arbitration, Liv. XXXI. 2, 1; Polyb. XVI. 27. The peace negotiations are conducted in Rome, whither Attalus sends representatives, Polyb. XVIII. 10. His claims are put forward, but the Roman senate dictates the terms, and the king of Pergamum has no part in the final decision, Liv. XXXII. 33, 4[1].

Eumenes.

6. Consulted by Rome as ally, Polyb. XXI. 10; Liv. XXXVII. 37. Signs of clientship in the peace negotiations with Antiochus (190 B.C.), which were all carried on in Rome, and Eumenes went thither to state his requests,

[1] A passage in Livy (XXXII. 8, 9), which, if true, seems certainly to savour of exaggeration, makes Attalus in 198 B.C. ask for a release of his forces, because Antiochus III has attacked his kingdom, and if Rome is unwilling, for help against him instead. Rome replies in grand language and sends a finely worded message to Antiochus, which persuades him to desist. Attalus later sends to Rome a crown of gold in thanks. Besides the fact that the language used is quite inconsistent with the real relations of the two kings to Rome, Antiochus was in 198 B.C. attacking Coele-Syria, and could only have troubled Attalus by a winter campaign. We must not therefore rely upon the passage as illustrating the dependence of Attalus upon Rome. *v.* Niese, *Geschich. der Hell. und Mac. St.*, Bk. X. § 8 n.

Liv. xxxvii. 45, 21. Rome decided without appeal what each state should have, Liv. *ib.* 56, 1–4; Polyb. xxi. 18; 24; 46.

Polyb. xxi. 18, 4: (the senate) *εἰσεκαλέσαντο πρῶτον τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ λέγειν ἠξίουν μετὰ παρρησίας ὧν βούλεται τυχεῖν παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου.* Eumenes' first reply was:

ib. 6: *ἄριστον εἶναι νομίζει τὸ διδόναι τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν ἐκείνοις καὶ περὶ αὑτοῦ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν.*

7. Rome in granting to Eumenes the towns taken from his father by Antiochus ordains that they shall pay the same tribute to Eumenes as formerly to Attalus, thus to some extent limiting his power of regulating his dependencies, Polyb. xxi. 24; 46.

Polyb. xxi. 46, 10: *τῆς δ' Ἀσίας Φρυγίαν...Μυσούς... Λυκαονίαν...ταύτας μὲν οὖν ἔδωκαν Εὐμένει τὰς δωρεάς.*

Arbitration imposed by Rome:

(Eumenes and the Gauls):

8. Liv. xxxviii. 37, 6: Gallis responsum, cum Eumenes rex venisset, tum daturum (sc. Manlium) iis leges. (188 B.C.)

9. *ib.* 40, 1: Manlius evocatis eo regulis Gallorum leges, quibus pacem cum Eumene servarent, dixit.

(Eumenes and Antiochus):

10. Liv. xxxix. 22, 9: legatum eum (L. Scipionem) post damnationem missum in Asiam ad dirimenda inter Antiochum et Eumenem reges certamina, Valerius Antias est auctor.

11. Complaints of Eumenes against Philip heard in Rome, Polyb. xxii. 6 (9); xxiii. 1. (186–5 B.C.)

(Eumenes and Prusias):

12. Justin. xxxii. 4, 8: missi a senatu legati sunt qui utrumque regem (sc. Prusiam et Eumenem) in pacem

cogerent. Cf. Liv. XXXIX. 46, 9 ; Polyb. III. 6, 3. Eumenes later sent a crown in gratitude to Rome, Trog. *prol.* 32.

(Eumenes and Pharnaces):

13. Polyb. XXIV. 1, 2 : *τῶν περὶ τὸν Μάρκον πρεσβευτῶν, οὓς ἀπεστάλκεισαν ἐπὶ τὸν Εὐμένει καὶ Φαρνάκῃ συνεστηκότα πόλεμον...* Cf. *ib.* 5 and 14 ; Liv. XL. 20 ; Diod. XXIX. 25. A free hand was at last given to Eumenes, Polyb. XXIV. 1 (XXV. 2). (183–2 B.C.)

Services in war:

14. Assists Rome against Perseus, App. *Mac.* 11 ; Liv. XLII. 14 ; 26, 7. That he helped Rome to the end of the war appears from Liv. XLIV. 28, 7, contradicting a former statement of Livy (XLIV. 13, 9 ; 20, 6) that he stopped helping after 169 B.C.

15. Some suspicion that Eumenes had had dealings with Perseus caused Rome to assume a higher tone from 168 B.C. onwards. Thus she declared his Galatian dependents free, Polyb. XXX. 28 (XXXI. 2, 6); Trog. *Prol.* 34[1].

16. Commissions sent to hear complaints against him and to arbitrate, Polyb. XXX. 27 ; 30, 7 ; XXXI. 1, 8 ; 3, 4 ; 6; Diod. XXXI. 10.

Eumenes forbidden to come to Rome (167 B.C.):

17. Liv. *Ep.* 46 : Eumenes rex Romam venit ; qui, quia Macedonico bello medium egerat, ne aut hostis iudicatus videretur, si exclusus esset, aut liberatus crimine, si admitteretur, in commune lex lata est, ne cui regi Romam venire liceret.

Polyb. XXX. 19 (20): *ὡς γὰρ καθόλου δυσαρεστούμενοι ταῖς τῶν βασιλέων ἐπιδημίαις, δόγμα τι τοιοῦτον ἐξέβαλον, μηδένα βασιλέα παραγίγνεσθαι πρὸς αὐτούς.* The decree reached Eumenes at Brundisium.

[1] For the subjection of the Gauls to Eumenes, *v.* **8**, **9** *sup.* A thousand Gauls served under him against Perseus, Liv. XLII. 55, 7 ; 57, 7. Eumenes was also overlord of Pessinus, *v.* **18.**

18. Part of Eumenes' kingdom offered by Rome to Attalus, his brother, Polyb. XXX. 1, XXXI. 1 (9); Liv. XLV. 19.

Independence:

19. Treaties with Cretan towns, *S. I. G.* I². 288; Polyb. XXIX. 6, 1; 7, 8. Garrison lent to Cydon, *ib.* XXVIII. 14 f. Friendship with two Armenian chiefs, Artaxias and Mithridates, who were included with Eumenes in the peace with Pharnaces, Polyb. XXV. 2 (XXVI. 6). Later Mithridates sends help to Attalus II against Prusias, *ib.* XXXIII. 12, 1. War against Pharnaces, *v.* 13 (end), and Selge in Pisidia, Polyb. XXXI. 1 (9), 3; Trog. *Prol.* 34. Helps Rhodes to suppress her rebel subjects, the Lycians, Polyb. XXIV. 15 (XXV. 5, 13), and Antiochus IV to seize the Syrian throne, App. *Syr.* 45, and cf. Liv. XLII. 6, 6.

But when his friends came into collision with Rome, they had to be deserted by Eumenes; thus he broke off friendship with the Aetolians, when they joined Antiochus, and renewed it later (*S. I. G.* I². 295 f.). He also made an offensive and defensive alliance with Ariarathes IV, when the latter became a friend of Rome, Polyb. XXIV. 1; Liv. XXXVIII. 39, 6.

Attalus II.

20. Attalus paid several visits to Rome on behalf of his brother Eumenes, cf. Polyb. XXX. 1, XXXI. 1 (9), and probably, as the future successor of Eumenes, who was long childless, made friendship with Rome on his own account before his brother's death. He seems to have borne the title 'king' as early as 169 B.C., and sent an embassy to Rome at that time, Suet. *de Gram.* 2. In 159 B.C. he succeeded Eumenes as regent for his nephew, Strabo XIII. 4, 2. Renewed friendship with Rome, Polyb. XXXIII. 18, 2; Fränkel, *Inschr. von Perg.* 224 Z, 17 f.

Foreign policy:

21. *Münchener Sitzungsberichte* (1860) p. 180 (quoted by Momms. *Rom. Geschichte*, Bk. IV. ch. 1, note) gives a letter of Attalus shewing that in his state council it had been resolved to do nothing in respect of Galatia without consulting Rome. [Found also in Michel, *Recueil*, 45 Cz. 9 ff.]

Submits to Roman arbitration in his quarrel with Prusias:

22. Polyb. XXXIII. 12: οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι τὸν μὲν Ἄτταλον ἐκέλευον...αὐτὸν μὲν μὴ κατάρχειν τοῦ πολέμου. Cf. XXXII. 16 (28), XXXIII. 1.

23. Polyb. XXXVII. 6: Ῥωμαῖοι ἔπεμψαν πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς ἐπιληψομένους τῆς ὁρμῆς τῆς τοῦ Νικομήδους καὶ κωλύσοντας τὸν Ἄτταλον πολεμεῖν τῷ Προυσίᾳ. Cf. App. *Mith.* 6; Diod. XXXII. 20; Liv. *Ep.* 50.

Services to Rome:

24. Helped against Andriscus, the Macedonian pretender, Strabo XIII. p. 624, and against the Achaeans, Paus. VII. 16, 8, where he is said to have received some Achaean spoils through his general.

25. Sends his nephew to secure Roman recognition beforehand, Polyb. XXXIII. 18, 2.

Independence:

26. Alliance with Ariarathes V, *S. I. G.* 1[1]. 224 f., Plut. *de Frat. Amor.* 18, Polyb. XXXII. 12 (22), XXXIII. 12; with Mithridates of Armenia, Polyb. XXXIII. 12; and with Crete, as a decree of Aptera shews. Suppressed Selge in Pisidia, Trog. *Prol.* 34, and supported Alexander Balas against Demetrius I of Syria, whom Rome would not recognise as king, Liv. *Ep.* 52; Justin. XXXV. 1, 6. Rome's consent was first obtained by Alexander, Polyb. XXXIII. 18.

Waged war on Diegylis, a Thracian chief, who had attacked his Thracian possessions, App. *Mith.* 6 ; Strabo XIII. p. 624 ; Trog. *Prol.* 36.

Attalus III.

27. Sent gifts to Numantia, Cic. *Deiot.* 19.

His will :

28. Liv. *Ep.* 59 : Asiam occupavit, cum testamento Attali...legata populo Romano libera esse deberet (sc. Aristonicus). Cf. Strabo XIII. p. 624 ; Justin. XXXVI. 4, 5 ; App. *Mith.* 62 ; Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 14.

29. Decree of Pergamenes : ἐπεὶ βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος Φιλομήτωρ καὶ Εὐεργέτη[ς μεθισ]τάμενος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέλοιπεν τὴ[μ] πατρίδα ἡμῶν ἐλευθέραν...(δεῖ δὲ ἐπικυρωθῆναι τὴν διαθή[κη]ν ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων).

Clientship ; words put into the mouth of Mithridates VI by Sallust :

30. Sall. *Frag.* IV. 413 : Eumenem, cuius amicitiam gloriose ostentant, initio prodidere Antiocho pacis mercedem ; post, Attalum custodem agri captivi sumptibus et contumeliis ex rege miserrimum servorum effecere, simulatoque impio testamento filium eius Aristonicum... per triumphum duxere.

VII. Syria.

Antiochus III.

1. Peace between Rome and Antiochus in 190 B.C., Polyb. XXI. 43 (45) ; Liv. XXXVIII. 38 ; App. *Syr.* 38. 'Friendship' to exist between them on certain conditions, Polyb. *ib.*

2. For the arbitration of Rome between Eumenes and Antiochus *v.* VI. 10 *supra.* This arbitration however was,

in the case of Antiochus, a condition of the treaty to secure him from attack at the hands of Rome's clients, *v.* Polyb. XXI. 43, 26.

Seleucus IV.

3. Succeeded in 187 B.C. and continued to pay off the indemnity, Liv. XLII. 6, 8. Sent son, Demetrius, as hostage, Polyb. XXXI. 2 (12), 2. Visited by Titus Flamininus in 183 B.C., probably that his attitude to Rome might be examined, Polyb. XXIII. 5; Plut. *Tit.* 20. Since Rhodians escort his daughter to Perseus, he evidently observed the terms of the treaty made by Rome with his father in regard to a fleet, Polyb. XXV. 4, 8; *C. I. G.* 2275; App. *Mac.* 11.

Antiochus IV.

4. Upon the death of Seleucus in 175 B.C. his brother Antiochus crossed from Greece and seized the throne. He had just been liberated from Rome, and Demetrius become a hostage in his stead. Since Demetrius was only a boy, Antiochus was the legitimate successor according to the ideas of the time. For his enterprise with the aid of Eumenes *v.* App. *Syr.* 45.

Clientship:

(*a*) Seeks recognition, and pays last instalment of the indemnity:

5. Liv. XLII. 6: et ab Antiocho...legati venerunt, quorum princeps Apollonius...regem excusavit quod stipendium serius quam ad diem praestaret. Id se omne advexisse...Petere regem ut quae cum patre suo societas atque amicitia fuisset, ea secum renovaretur, imperaretque sibi populus Romanus quae bono fidelique socio regi essent imperanda: se nullo usquam cessaturum officio.

(*b*) Foreign policy:

6. In his quarrel with Egypt, he first appealed to Rome, Polyb. XXVII. 19. Rome being too busy to intervene, Antiochus assumed the aggressive. On the point of reducing Egypt, he was confronted by Popillius, the Roman envoy, and promised unconditional submission to Rome's wishes, Polyb. XXIX. 27. Compare

7. Liv. XLV. 13, 2: venerunt Antiochi legati referentes omni victoria potiorem pacem regi, senatui quae placuisset, visam, eumque haud secus quam deorum imperio legatorum Romanorum iussis paruisse.

Promises Rome aid:

8. Liv. XLII. 26, 7: redierunt legati qui renuntiarunt Eumenem...Antiochum...pollicitos omnia, quae populus Romanus imperasset, praestaturos (against Perseus). *ib.* XLV. 13, 2: si quid imperatum foret, adiuturum regem fuisse. Cf. App. *Mac.* 11, Rome's request for aid.

9. Antiochus only sent some Indian elephants, Polyaenus IV. 21.

(*c*) Visited by a commission, which he receives as Rome's servant:

10. Polyb. XXX. 27 (XXXI. 5): ἦκον...πρεσβευταὶ κατασκόπων ἔχοντες τάξιν...(Antiochus) πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ τῆς αὐλῆς παρεχώρησε τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς, μικροῦ δὲ καὶ τοῦ διαδήματος, κατὰ τὴν ἐπίφασιν (*i.e.* in speciem quidem).

Independence:

11. Made war upon the Jews and subdued them, Jos. *Ant.* XII. 236; attacked Coele Syria, as a former dependency (cf. Hieronym. *Daniel* XI. 21 f., simulatione clementiae obtinuit regnum Syriae), and the rebellious satrapy of Persis, Tac. *Hist.* V. 8, Jos. *Ant.* XII. 293 f., 1 Macc. iii. 25 ff., Pliny, *H. N.* VI. 147, 152. Subjected

Armenia and advanced beyond, App. *Syr.* 45, 46 ; Diod. *Fr.* xxx.—xl. (supplement) 9. For his friendship with Greek states *v.* Polyb. xxvi. 1 ; Liv. xli. 20.

12. That he evidently did not hold himself bound by the treaty of Ant. III appears from his maintenance of a fleet and many elephants, Polyb. xxxi. 2 (12).

13. For his institution of Roman customs in his kingdom, learnt by him when a hostage, *v.* Polyb. xxvi. 1, 5 ; Liv. xli. 20.

Antiochus V.

Antiochus IV, having died on his Eastern expedition, left a young son upon the throne. (164 B.C.)

Roman intervention :

14. Polyb. xxxi. 2 (12), 9 : *πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς περὶ Γνάιον Ὀκταούιον...ἐξέπεμψαν τοὺς διοικήσοντας τὰ κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν, ὡς αὐτὴ προῃρεῖτο διὰ τὸ μηδένα τὸν ἐμποδὼν στησόμενον εἶναι τοῖς ἐπιτατταμένοις.* Cf. Cic. *Phil.* ix. 4.

The ambassadors were charged to weaken the resources of the kingdom by burning the ships and ham-stringing the elephants (Polyb. *ib.* § 11), and to help to establish the boy as king (§ 6) that the government might be feeble (§ 7). Octavius was murdered by one of the enraged populace (ch. 11 (19)), and the senate then left the kingdom to itself, giving no answer to the excuses of Lysias, the king's guardian, in connexion with the murder of Octavius.

Demetrius I.

15. Seized the Syrian throne two years after the death of Ant. IV, having made his escape from Rome. He put to death the young son of Ant. IV, but Rome took little notice, merely refusing to recognise Demetrius.

Clientship:

16. (*a*) Seeks recognition:

Polyb. xxxi. 33 (xxxii. 4, 3): (Demetrius) *πάντα ποιήσειν Ῥωμαίοις ἀναδεχόμενος ἕως ἐξειργάσατο βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτῶν προσαγορευθῆναι*..... (Having gained the commissioners' recognition), *εὐθέως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἔπεμπε πρεσβευτὰς στέφανόν τε κομίζοντας καὶ τὸν αὐτόχειρα τὸν Γναίου γεγονότα.*

Senate's reply:

17. Polyb. xxxii. 3 (7), 13: *τεύξεται* (ὁ Δημ.) *τῶν φιλανθρώπων ἐὰν τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῇ τῇ συγκλήτῳ κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐξουσίαν.*

(*b*) Services, to secure his recognition:

18. Arrested and sent to Rome Andriscus, the Macedonian pretender, Justin. xxxv. 1; Liv. *Ep.* 49.

Effects of his failure to secure recognition:

19. i. Ariarathes V breaks off relations with him (*v.* ix. 11 *inf.*). ii. Rise of rivals, Timarchus, Diod. xxx.—xl. (supplement) 13; App. *Syr.* 45, 47: Alexander Balas, who at last gained Rome's sanction to seek the crown, and finally defeated and killed Dem., Just. xxxv. 1, 6; Liv. *Ep.* 52; App. *Syr.* 67, 70.

Alexander Balas I.

For his succession *v.* 19 *supra*.

Recognition by the senate:

20. Polyb. xxxiii. 18, 10: *Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ Λαοδίκη βασιλέως υἱοί, φίλου καὶ συμμάχου ἡμετέρου γεγενημένου ἐπελθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν σύγκλητον λόγους ἐποιήσαντο. ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν ἐπὶ τὴν πατρῴαν ἀρχὴν καταπορεύεσθαι καὶ βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἠξίουν, ἔδοξεν.* (150 B.C.)

(Polybius says that the claimants asked for Rome's active support or, failing that, her permission to others to help them. Eventually Attalus II, Ptolemy Philometor and Ariarathes combined to establish him. Rome did not carry out her promise to the full.)

21. Alexander was slain four years later by Demetrius II, supported by Ptolemy VI (146 B.C.). Rome took no notice, Diod. XXXII. 10; XXX.—XL. (supplement) 19; App. *Syr.* 67.

Tryphon and the end of the Syrian kings.

22. Demetrius II was expelled by Tryphon in 142 B.C., who acted at first on behalf of a young son of Balas, and then set the boy aside.

Tryphon seeks recognition, sending a gift:

23. Diod. XXXIII. 20: Τρύφων...ἔσπευδε τὴν δυναστείαν αὐτῷ διὰ δόγματος συγκλητικοῦ βεβαιῶσαι.

24. The senate ignored him, but accepted the gift in the name of the murdered child. Syria was still left to itself.

25. Civil wars reigned in Syria from 128 B.C. onwards, Liv. *Ep.* 62, 68, 70. In 83 B.C., upon the death of Antiochus XII, the Syrians, weary of the Seleucid broils, invited Tigranes of Armenia to annex the country, App. *Syr.* 48, 49; *Mith.* 105.

26. In part of Syria the Seleucid house seems to have continued a little longer. Compare:

Cicero, *Verr.* IV. 61: reges Syriae, regis Antiochi filios pueros, scitis Romae nuper fuisse, qui venerant non propter Syriae regnum (nam id sine controversia obtinebant ut a patre et a maioribus acceperant), sed regnum Aegypti ad se et ad Selenen matrem suam pertinere arbitrabantur.

27. The senate contented itself with recognising the Seleucids by renewing friendship with them, as a decree cited by Josephus shews (*Ant.* XIV. 209), but the following passage sums up Rome's attitude:

28. Strabo XIV. 5, 2: οὐδὲ Ῥωμαῖοί πω τοσοῦτον ἐφρόντιζον τῶν ἔξω τοῦ Ταύρου...ἔγνωσαν δὲ κακίᾳ τῶν ἀρχόντων συμβαῖνον τοῦτο, εἰ καὶ τὴν κατὰ γένος διαδοχὴν τὴν ἀπὸ Σελεύκου τοῦ Νικάτορος αὐτοὶ κεκυρωκότες ἠδοῦντο ἀφαιρεῖσθαι.

29. In 69 B.C. Lucullus established Antiochus XIII, whom Pompey deposed four years later, App. *Syr.* 48, 49.

ib. 49: (Pompey deposes Ant.) οὐδὲν ἐς Ῥωμαίους ἁμαρτόντα...λόγῳ, ὅτι τοὺς Σελευκίδας, ὑπὸ Τιγράνους ἐκπεσόντας οὐκ εἰκὸς ἦν ὅτι Συρίας ἄρχειν μᾶλλον ἢ Ῥωμαίους Τιγράνην νενικηκότας.

VIII. Bithynia.

Prusias I.

Rome first came into contact with Prusias, when she was seeking to isolate Antiochus in 192 B.C. Prusias after some hesitation promised Rome his assistance, App. *Syr.* 23.

Acts of submission to Rome:

(*a*) Surrender of Hannibal in 183 B.C.:

1. Liv. XXXIX. 51, 1: ad Prusiam regem legatos T. Quinctius Flamininus venit, quem suspectum Romanis et receptus post fugam Antiochi Hannibal et bellum adversus Eumenem motum faciebat.

(*b*) Cessation of hostilities against Eumenes:

2. Justin. XXXII. 4, 8: missi a senatu legati, qui utrumque regem in pacem cogerent. Cf. Polyb. III. 6, 3; Liv. XXXIX. 46, 9; 51, 1; Trog. *Prol.* 32.

Prusias II.

Prusias II probably renewed the friendship begun by his father, for it was evidently as a friend of Rome that he was expected to assist against Perseus[1].

3. Liv. XLII. 29, 3 : statuerat (Prusias) abstinere armis et eventum exspectare. Nam neque Romanos posse aequom censere adversus fratrem uxoris se arma ferre, et apud Persea victorem veniam per sororem impetrabilem fore.

His subsequent apologies in 167 B.C. for his late neutrality and his complete self-abasement, are a sign that he was regarded as having come short of his duties as client, not as ally.

4. Liv. XLV. 44 : Polybius eum regem (sc. Prusiam)... tradit pileatum, capite raso, obviam ire legatis solitum, libertumque se populi Romani ferre, et ideo insignia ordinis eius gerere ; Romae quoque, cum veniret in curiam, summisisse se, et osculo limen curiae contigisse. (He also asked for some land, *ib.*) Cf. Polyb. XXX. 18 (19) ; Diod. XXXI. 22 ; App. *Mith.* 2.

Clientship :

(*a*) Submits to Roman arbitration in his quarrel with Attalus II :

5. Polyb. XXXIII. 1 : *πρεσβευτὰς συνεξαπέστελλε* (sc. *ἡ σύγκλητος*)...*ἐντολὰς δοῦσα κωλύειν τὸν Προυσίαν Ἀττάλῳ πολεμεῖν.* Prusias did not yield until Rome renounced her friendship with him, *ib.* XXXIII. 12 ; 13. (154 B.C.) Cf. also *ib.* XXXII. 16 (28).

[1] Contrast the conduct of the Rhodians, who, we know, had not yet a definite alliance either with Rome or the kings : 'eam (amicitiam) (sc. with Perseus) quoniam ita Romanis visum sit in societatem se belli trahere, interrupisse,' Liv. XLIV. 14, 8. (169 B.C.)

(*b*) Appealed to Rome against Nicomedes, his son:

6. Polyb. XXXVI. 14 (XXXVII. 6): Ῥωμαῖοι ἔπεμψαν πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς...κωλύσοντας τὸν Ἄτταλον πολεμεῖν τῷ Προυσίᾳ. Attalus' friends in Rome arranged that the matter should be decided by the senate too late, and Prusias was slain, Liv. *Ep.* 50. Rome had some difficulty in ascertaining the merits of the case, Polyb. XXXII. 16 (28). (149 B.C.) Cf. also App. *Mith.* 6; Diod. XXXII. 20.

7. (*c*) Nominally sought recognition for his son Nicomedes by sending him to be brought up in Rome (according to Livy XLV. 44 in 167 B.C.). He apparently sent him a second time as a young man, for fear that his subjects should make Nicomedes king in his stead.

Value of protectorate:

8. Zon. IX. 28, 1: ταῦτα (sc. the murder of Perseus) ἠνίασε μὲν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, οὐ μὴν καὶ εἰς πόλεμον ἐξηρέθεσε. Rome even recognised Nicomedes.

Independence of Prusias:

9. Made treaties of friendship with Cretan towns, *B. C. H.* III. 425.

Nicomedes II.

Succeeded 149 B.C., *v.* 6 *supra.*

Clientship:

10. Services to Rome in war against Aristonicus, Strabo XIV. p. 646; Eutrop. IV. 22; Oros. V. 10, 2. He was even invited to send troops to Italy:

Diod. XXXVI. 1: κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς Κίμβρους τοῦ Μαρίου στρατείαν ἔδωκεν ἡ σύγκλητος ἐξουσίαν τῷ Μαρίῳ ἐκ τῶν πέραν θαλάττης ἐθνῶν μεταπέμπεσθαι συμμαχίαν. ὁ μὲν οὖν Μάριος ἐξέπεμψε πρὸς Νικομήδην τὸν τῆς Βιθυνίας βασιλέα περὶ βοηθείας.

Bithynia overrun by Roman traders and slave-dealers:

11. Diod. xxxvi. 1: when Marius sent to Nicomedes for contingents, he replied 'Τοὺς πλείους τῶν Βιθυνῶν ὑπὸ τῶν δημοσιωνῶν διαρπαγέντας δουλεύειν ἐν ταῖς ἐπαρχίαις.'

12. For the licence allowed to Nicomedes between 100 and 92 B.C. through want of firmness on the part of the senate, and for his encroachments upon Paphlagonia and Cappadocia, *v.* Momm. *Rom. Geschich.* Bk. iv. ch. 8.

Nicomedes III.

Recognition by Rome:

13. App. *Mith.* 7: Ῥωμαίων αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὡς πατρῴαν ψηφισαμένων.

14. *ib.* 13: ὧδε Μιθριδάτης ἐς Νικομήδη ἔπραξεν, ὃν ὑμεῖς, ὦ Ῥωμαῖοι, Βιθυνῶν ἐστήσασθε βασιλεύειν.

Services to Rome:

15. Julius Caesar as a young man was sent to Nicomedes' court by M. Minucius Thermus to fetch the fleet (Plut. *Caes.* 1; Suet. *Jul.* 2, 49). 'The fleet' was possibly that of Rome wintering in Bithynia, but in any case would probably contain a Bithynian contingent. Under the Empire Tacitus (*Ann.* iv. 5) speaks of 'sociae triremes apud idonea provinciarum.'

Protected by Rome:

16. Restored on several occasions, App. *Mith.* 11; Liv. *Ep.* 74, 83. Attacks Mithridates under pressure from M'. Aquillius, who thus replies to Mith.'s protests:

17. App. *Mith.* 14: οὔτε Νικομήδους ἀνεξόμεθα πολεμουμένου, οὐ γὰρ ἡγούμεθα Ῥωμαίοις συμφέρειν βλάπτεσθαι Νικομήδη.

(The use of 'συμφέρειν' excludes the possibility of the existence of an offensive and defensive alliance between

Rome and Nicomedes. Rome's obligation was evidently that of protector to client, not that of an ally.)

Bequest of Bithynia to Rome (84 B.C.):

18. Liv. *Ep.* 93: Nicomedes...populum Romanum fecit heredem, regnumque eius in provinciae formam redactum est.

App. *Mith.* 8: *νίωνὸς τοῦδε* (sc. Nicomedes, grandson of Prusias II) *Ῥωμαίοις τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐν διαθήκαις ἀπέλιπεν.*

ib. 71: *Νικομήδους...τεθνεῶτος ἄπαιδος.*

IX. Cappadocia.

Ariarathes IV.

Admitted to friendship, 188 B.C.:

1. Polyb. XXI. 45, 1: *Μάλλιος, ὁ ἀνθύπατος, τριάκοντα τάλαντα πραξάμενος παρὰ Ἀριαράθου φίλον αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατο Ῥωμαίων.*

2. Liv. XXXVIII. 39, 6: Ariarathes rex parte dimidia pecuniae imperatae beneficio Eumenis...remissa in amicitiam est acceptus. Cf. Zon. IX. 24, p. 321, who states that he was 'called friend and ally.'

The treaty exceptionally included the king's subjects:

3. Strabo XII. 2, 11: *ξυνέβη δέ, ἡνίκα πρῶτον Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν διῴκουν, νικήσαντες Ἀντίοχον, φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας ἐποιοῦντο πρός τε τὰ ἔθνη καὶ τοὺς βασιλέας, τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις βασιλεῦσιν αὐτοῖς καθ' ἑαυτοὺς δοθῆναι τὴν τιμὴν ταύτην, τῷ δὲ Καππάδοκι καὶ αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ ἔθνει κοινῇ.*

4. Henceforward the Cappadocian house maintained a close alliance with the Attalids, and followed a similar policy of obedience to Rome, *v.* n. 5 *infra.*

(*a*) Foreign policy:

Submission to Roman arbitration:

5. Liv. XL. 20, 1: legationes...in senatum introduxerunt regum...Eumenis et Ariarathis...et Pharnacis; nec ultra quicquam eis responsum est, quam missuros qui de controversiis eorum cognoscerent statuerentque. Cf. Polyb. XXIII. 9, XXIV. 8.

Services to Rome in war:

6. Liv. XLII. 29, 4: Ariarathes, Cappadocum rex, praeterquam quod Romanis suo nomine auxilia pollicitus erat, ex quo est iunctus Eumeni adfinitate, in omnia belli pacisque se consociaverat consilia. Cf. Liv. XLV. 13, 2; Justin. XXXIII. 1, 2; XXXVIII. 6, 3.

(His support had been requested by Rome, App. *Mac.* 11.)

(*b*) Commends his son to Roman guardianship:

7. Liv. XLII. 19, 4: (legates sent by Ariarathes) quorum oratio fuit regem educandum filium Romam misisse, ut iam inde a puero adsuesceret moribus Romanis hominibusque. Petere ut eum non sub hospitium modo privatorum custodia, sed publicae etiam curae ac velut tutelae vellent esse.

Independence:

For his independent action against Pharnaces *v.* Append. A. VI. 13.

Ariarathes V.

Recognition by Rome:

8. Polyb. XXXI. 3 (14), 1: *παρεγένοντο...παρ' Ἀριαράθου τοῦ νεωστὶ διαδεδεγμένου τὴν Καππαδοκῶν βασιλείαν πρέσβεις, ἀνανεωσόμενοι τήν τε φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν...καὶ καθόλου παρακαλέσοντες τὴν σύγκλητον ἀποδέξασθαι τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως εὔνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν, ἣν ἔχει καὶ κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν πρὸς ἅπαντας Ῥωμαίους.*

9. Liv. *Ep.* 46: (Ariarathes) regnum accepit et amicitiam cum populo R...renovavit.

10. Polyb. xxxi. 7 (17): (Ariarathes) *νομίσας...ἐν ὄρθῳ κεῖσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῷ, ἐπειδὴ καθῖκται τῆς Ῥωμαίων εὐνοίας, ἔθνε τοῖς θεοῖς χαριστήρια τῶν γεγονότων.*

Foreign policy. (*a*) General attitude:

11. Diod. xxxi. 39: (sends envoys) *διασαφοῦντας τὴν εὔνοιαν τοῦ βασιλέως ἣν ἔχει πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, ἔτι δὲ τὴν δι' ἐκείνους γενομένην ἀπόρρησιν τοῦ γάμου καὶ φιλίας πρὸς Δημήτριον.*
Cf. Polyb. xxxi. 3 (14); Justin. xxxv. 1, 2.

12. Perhaps because he knew how Rome would regard the action, he refused to join Artaxias of Armenia in a partition of Sophene, Diod. xxxi. 32; Polyb. xxxi. 16 (17).

(*b*) Services in war:

13. Perished fighting for Rome against Aristonicus (Strabo xii. p. 534; xiv. p. 646; Oros. v. 10, 2; Eutrop. iv. 22; Justin. xxxvii. 1, 2).
His children received extra territory in recompense, Strabo *ib.*

(*c*) Arbitration from Rome accepted:

14. Polyb. xxxi. 8 (13), 4: *παραγενομένων πρεσβευτῶν τῶν περὶ Γνάιον Ὀκταούιον καὶ διαλεγομένων τῷ βασιλεῖ περὶ τῶν πρὸς τοὺς Γαλάτας αὐτῷ διαφερόντων,...φήσας* (sc. ὁ Ἀριαρ.) *εὐεπάγωγος εἶναι πρὸς τὸ κριθέν....*

15. In another dispute with the Gauls either this Ariarathes or another Cappadocian king of the same name was sentenced to pay damages to the Gauls for injury to their land caused by his engineering operations, Strabo xii. 2, 8.

Protected as client:

16. Liv. *Ep.* 47: Ariarathes, Cappadociae rex, consilio Demetrii regis Syriae et viribus pulsus regno, a senatu restitutus est. Cf. Polyb. xxxii. 10 (24); App. *Syr.* 47.

The senate however in arbitrating only restored him to half his original kingdom, allowing Orophernes to keep

the other half. Moreover he was left to regain even this half himself with the aid of Attalus II (Polyb. III. 5, 2). Orophernes was soon expelled by his subjects (Polyb. XXXII. 25) and Ariarathes resumed control of the whole of Cappadocia.

17. Sent a son to be presented to the senate, Polyb. XXXIII. 18, 5.

Independence:

18. Made war on Priene to recover money deposited there by Orophernes. Priene appealed to Rome in vain (*circ.* 156 B.C.), Polyb. XXXIII. 6. Restored Mithrabarzanes to his throne instead of dividing Sophene with Artaxias the Armenian, Diod. XXXI. 32; Polyb. XXXI. 16 (17), 5. Close friendships with Greek towns; introduced Hellenic culture into Cappadocia, and his name appears on Attic coins, *S. I. G.* I². 298; *B. C. H.* (1895) 19, 541; Diod. XXXI. 28.

Ariobarzanes I.

For the murder of Ariarathes V's successor of the same name and also that of his son at the instigation of Mith. VI of Pontus, *v.* Momms. *Rom. Gesch.* Bk. IV. ch. 8. Rome did not avenge them save by expelling the usurper nominated by Mithridates.

Recognition of Ariobarzanes I, the Cappadocians having refused 'freedom':

19. Strabo XII. 2, 11: ἐκλιπόντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ γένους, οἱ μὲν Ῥωμαῖοι συνεχώρουν αὐτοῖς αὐτονομεῖσθαι κατὰ τὴν συγκειμένην φιλίαν τε καὶ συμμαχίαν πρὸς τὸ ἔθνος, οἱ δὲ πρεσβευσάμενοι τὴν μὲν ἐλευθερίαν παρῃτοῦντο (οὐ γὰρ δύνασθαι φέρειν αὐτὴν ἔφασαν), βασιλέα δ' ἠξίουν αὐτοῖς ἀποδειχθῆναι. οἱ δὲ...ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ἑλέσθαι κατὰ χειροτονίαν, ὃν ἂν βούλωνται. καὶ εἵλοντο Ἀριοβαρζάνην. Cf. Justin. XXXVIII. 1.

Clientship:

The 'Majesty' of Rome:

20. Plut. *Sull.* 5: λέγεται (sc. ὁ Σύλλας) τρεῖς δίφρους προθέμενος, τὸν μὲν Ἀριοβαρζάνῃ, τὸν δὲ Ὀροβάζῳ, τὸν δὲ αὐτῷ, μέσος ἀμφοῖν καθεζόμενος, χρηματίζειν. ἐφ' ᾧ τὸν μὲν Ὀρόβαζον ὕστερον ὁ τῶν Πάρθων βασιλεὺς ἀπέκτεινε.

Protected as client:

21. Restored by Sulla, when expelled by Mithridates, Plut. *Sull.* 5; Liv. *Ep.* 70; restored by Aquillius (88 B.C.), Liv. *Ep.* 74; by Sulla according to the treaty with Mithrid. (84 B.C.), Liv. *Ep.* 83; Plut. *Sull.* 22. Soon after he was expelled by Tigranes, but was finally confirmed in his kingdom by Pompey, receiving additional territory.

22. App. *Mith.* 105: Ἀριοβαρζάνῃ δ' ἀπεδίδου βασιλείαν Καππαδοκίας, καὶ προσεπέδωκε Σωφηνὴν καὶ Γορδυηνήν.

So many restorations would make him appear more than ever the nominee of Rome.

General attitude to Rome:

23. Assumption of the title Philorhomaios, *C. I. G.* 357.

Internal affairs:

24. Cappadocia reorganised for the king by Pompey, App. *Mith.* 115.

Ariobarzanes II.

Recognition:

25. Ariob. I having resigned in his son's favour, the latter was confirmed in the kingdom by Pompey, Val. Max. v. 7, 2; App. *Mith.* 105.

Of this son it is only known that he had friendship with Athens (*C. I. G.* 357) and died through a conspiracy about 52 B.C. (Cic. *Fam.* XV. 2, 5).

Ariobarzanes III.

Recognition :

26. Cic. *Fam.* xv. 2, 8 : regem quem vos honorificentissime appellassetis, nullo postulante ; *ib.* II. 17 : Ariobarzanem quia senatus per me regem appellavit.

Protected as client :

27. Cic. *Fam.* xv. 2, 4 : cum enim vestra auctoritas intercessisset ut ego regem Ariobarzanem Eusebem et Philorhomaeum tuerer, eiusque regis salutem incolumitatemque regni defenderem, regi regnoque praesidio essem, adiunxissetisque salutem eius regis populo senatuique curae esse, quod nullo unquam de rege decretum esset a nostro ordine. Cf. xv. 2, 8.

28. Plut. *Cic.* 36 : (Cicero) *εἶτα κλήρῳ λαχὼν τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν* Κιλικίαν...*ἔπλευσε,...προσταχθὲν αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ περὶ* Καππαδοκίαν *Ἀριοβαρζάνῃ τῷ βασιλεῖ φίλα καὶ πειθήνια παρασχεῖν.*

Nature of the protection :

29. Cic. *Fam.* xv. 2, 7 : cohortatus illum ut in sua vita conservanda primum regnare disceret. (The King was very weak, and his father had died through a plot.)

30. Cic. *Fam.* xv. 4, 6 : Metram et eum quem tu mihi diligenter commendaras Athenaeum, importunitate Athenaidis exilio multatos, in maxima apud regem auctoritate gratiaque constitui.

31. *ib.* : cumque magnum bellum...concitaretur, si sacerdos armis se...defenderet...ego tuto iis, qui novari aliquid volebant, perfeci ut e regno ille discederet, rexque sine tumultu ac sine armis omni auctoritate aulae communita regnum cum dignitate obtineret.

32. Cic. *Fam.* xv. 2, 7: cum rex a me equitatum cohortesque de exercitu meo postularet, etsi intellegebam vestro senatus consulto non modo posse me id facere, sed etiam debere.

33. Protected also later by Caesar's lieutenant against Pharnaces, [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 34, 36, 37.

General attitude to Rome:

34. Assumed the surname Philorhomaios, *C. I. G.* 358.

Services in war:

35. Helped the nearest Roman general in the Civil wars, Lucan II. 592, III. 244; Dio XLII. 48.

Internal affairs:

36. Caesar settles position of Ariarathes, the king's brother.

[Caesar] *Bell. Alex.* 66: Fratrem Ariobarzanis, Ariarathem, cum bene meritus uterque eorum de republica esset, ne aut regni hereditas Ariarathem sollicitaret, aut heres regni terreret, Ariobarzani *attribuit*, qui sub eius imperio ac ditione esset.

He evidently gave Ariarathes little land. Cf. Cic. *Att.* XIII. 2: 'Ariarathes...Romam venit. Vult, opinor, regnum aliquod emere a Caesare. Nam quo modo nunc est, pedem ubi ponat in suo, non habet.'

Condition of the kingdom under Roman protection:

37. Cic. *Att.* VI. 1, 3: ei (Pompeio) sic nunc solvitur (sc. ab Ariobarzane)...nec id satis efficit in usuram menstruam. Sed Gnaeus noster clementer id fert...Alii neque solvit cuiquam, neque potest solvere. Nullum enim aerarium, nullum vectigal habet. Appii instituto tributa imperat. Ea vix in fenus Pompeii, quod satis sit, efficiunt. Amici regis duo tresve perdivites sunt, sed ii suum tam diligenter tenent quam ego aut tu...Nihil illo regno spoliatius, nihil rege egentius. Itaque aut tutela cogito me abdicare aut fenus et impendium recusare.

38. Caesar pardoned Ariobarzanes for assisting Pompey and even gave him Lesser Armenia, Dio XLII. 48, but in 42 B.C. he was put to death by Cassius, App. *B. C.* IV. 63; Dio XLVII. 33. Archelaus, son of the priest of Comana, was then made king by Antonius, and confirmed in his sovereignty by Augustus, Strabo XII. p. 540.

X. Pontus.

Mithridates V.

Friendship with Rome:

1. App. *Mith.* 10: ὅ γέ τοι Ῥωμαίοις πρῶτος ἐν φιλίᾳ γενόμενος, καὶ ναῦς τινὰς ἐπὶ Καρχηδονίους καὶ συμμαχίαν ὀλίγην παρασχών, βασιλεὺς Πόντου, Μιθριδάτης ὁ Εὐεργέτης ἐπίκλησιν.

(Pharnaces therefore who attacked Eumenes remained outside Roman influence.)

2. *ib.* 56: Mith. VI speaks of φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας ἰδίας καὶ πατρῴας.

Services in war:

3. Assisted against Carthage, 148 B.C., *v.* n. 1 *supra*, and Aristonicus, 132 B.C., Strabo XIV. p. 646; Eutrop. IV. 22; Oros. V. 10, 2.

Rewards:

4. Received Greater Phrygia, 128 B.C., in return for large bribes, Justin. XXXVII. 1, 2; C. Gracchus *fr.* quoted by Momms. *Rom. Gesch.* Bk. IV. ch. 3, note. After his murder in 120 B.C. Rome at once resumed control of Greater Phrygia, uniting it with Asia, Justin. XXXVIII. 5, 2; App. *Mith.* 11, 56.

Mithridates VI.

5. Friendship with Rome, *v.* n. 2 *supra*, and cf. App. *Mith.* 10, 12, 13, 16, 56.

Independence:

6. Mithridates VI never really came under Rome's overlordship. He evacuated Paphlagonia at the instance of Sulla in 92 B.C., but his presence there was an open breach of the peace (App. *Mith.* 57). He extended his kingdom to the North of the Black Sea, disregarding a previous manifesto of Rome:

App. *Mith.* 13: τῷ δ' αὐτῷ λόγῳ κεκελευκότων ὑμῶν τοῖς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ βασιλεῦσι τῆς Εὐρώπης μηδὲ ἐπιβαίνειν, τὰ πολλὰ Χερρονήσου περιέσπασεν.

7. Made alliances with the Thracians and Scythians, App. *ib.*

8. He once promised aid to Rome conditionally:

App. *Mith.* 16: καὶ τάδε πράξασιν ὑμῖν ὑπέχομαι συμμαχήσειν ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰτάλους βασιλέα Μιθριδάτην.

But he also disregarded Rome's demands for his cooperation:

App. *Mith.* 11: καὶ συλλαβεῖν...ἐπέστειλαν...τῷ Μιθριδάτῃ, ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν...οὐ συνέπραττε.

Compare also:

9. Sall. *Fr.* 413: quid ego me appellem? quem diiunctum undique regnis et tetrarchis ab imperio eorum, quia fama erat divitem nec serviturum esse, per Nicomedem bello lacessiverunt.

10. Vell. II. 40: (Mithridates) ultimus omnium iuris sui regum praeter Parthicos.

11. Even his treaty with Sulla in 84 B.C. did not increase his dependence. He was not even forbidden, as

Antiochus III had been, to keep a fleet, Plut. *Sull.* 22. He surrendered 70 ships only, whereas his fleet in 89 B.C. numbered 300 ships, App. *Mith.* 13. In 65 B.C. he offered to pay tribute for his kingdom but could not trust himself to an unconditional surrender, App. *Mith.* 107.

XI. Bosporus.

Pharnaces.

1. Mithridates VI had received under his protection the king of the Bosporus, whom the Scythians were threatening, App. *Mith.* 78; Strabo VII. pp. 309—312; *C. I. G.* 2103. Later he established his son Machares in the Bosporan kingdom, App. *Mith.* 113, and sent to him for contingents against the Romans, *ib.* 78. Machares however in 69 B.C. sent to Lucullus seeking friendship, Plut. *Luc.* 24; Liv. *Ep.* 98, and on that account was put to death by Mithridates and succeeded by his brother Pharnaces. He too plotted against his father, sent to tell Pompey of his death, and sought Rome's recognition of his claim to the Bosporus, 63 B.C.

Clientship:

Takes over the Bosporus in Rome's name:

2. Plut. *Pomp.* 41: τὰ δ' ἐκεῖ πάντα πράγματα Φαρνάκης κατεκληρώσατο, καὶ ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ καὶ Ῥωμαίοις γέγραφε ποιούμενος.

3. App. *Mith.* 113: Φαρνάκης δὲ Πομπηίῳ...ἔπεμπε... δεόμενος ἢ τῆς πατρῴας ἀρχῆς ἢ Βοσπόρου γε βασιλεύειν μόνον. Πομπήιος δὲ...Φαρνάκην...ἀπαλλάξαντα πόνου πολλοῦ τὴν Ἰταλίαν φίλον καὶ σύμμαχον Ῥωμαίοις ἐποιήσατο καὶ βασιλεύειν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Βοσπόρου.

4. Strabo VII. p. 310: ἐξ ἐκείνου δ' (sc. Mith. VI) ἡ βασιλεία γεγένηται Ῥωμαίοις ὑπήκοος.

5. This recognition Pharnaces earned by sending to Pompey the betrayers of M'. Aquillius, the corpse of Mith. VI, and hostages, App. *Mith.* 113.

6. N.B. Pompey exempted the Phanagoreans from his rule—Pharnaces received only what Rome chose to concede him, App. *ib.*[1]

Independence:

7. Owing to the position of his kingdom he was regarded as a 'rex externus.'

[Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 34, 2: Domitius turpe populo Romano esse statuit regna sociorum atque amicorum ab externo rege occupari.

For the same reason he was able to remain neutral in the civil wars, but tried to seize Pontus for himself. His downfall followed at Ziela in 47 B.C., and a private enemy, Asander, slew him, [Caes.] *ib.* 65–67; App. *Mith.* 120; Dio XLII. 45.

Mithridates the Pergamene, Asander, etc.

Promotion of Mithridates of Pergamum by Caesar 47 B.C.:

8. [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 78: Mithridatem Pergamenum ...regem Bospori constituit, quod sub imperio Pharnacis fuerat; provinciasque populi Romani a barbaris atque inimicis regibus, interposito amicissimo rege, munivit. Eidem tetrarchiam Gallograecorum iure gentis et cognationis adiudicavit.

This Mithridates was slain in occupying his kingdom.

The succeeding rulers all ascribed their sovereignty to the gift of Rome:

9. *Asander*, who after defeating Mithridates of Pergamum took command of the Bosporus as 'archon' in

[1] Livy (*Ep.* 113) calls Pharnaces king of Pontus, but he can only have held a very reduced portion of it. Cf. *Ep.* 102: Cn. Pompeius in provinciae formam Pontum redegit.

47 B.C. and was probably recognised by the Bosporans and barbarians as king soon after, seems only to have dated his kingship officially from 36 B.C., 23 being the greatest number of years that appears on his coins, which are numerous, and he died in 14 B.C., *C. I. G.* Vol. II. Introd. to Part XI., 1, 13; Strabo VII. p. 308. This year therefore, 36 B.C., was probably that in which Augustus recognised him as king instead of ethnarch, Lucian *Macrob.* 17.

10. A certain *Scribonius* took the kingdom in 14 B.C. after Asander's death, saying he was a descendant of Mithridates VI and 'had received the kingdom from Augustus,' Dio LIV. 24.

11. *Polemo*, whom Agrippa sent against Scribonius, was only able to take over the kingdom, when Agrippa came to Sinope, and frightened the Bosporans by his approach. Polemo then married Dynamis, the widow of Asander, the marriage 'being sanctioned by Augustus,' Dio *ib.*

XII. Galatia.

The tetrarchs.

1. When Rome first came into contact with Galatia (188 B.C.), the three tribes of Galatia were each divided into four tetrarchies, each tetrarchy having a tetrarch, a judge, and a general. Strabo says that within his memory there were three supreme chiefs, then two, and finally one, viz. Deiotarus, after the death of whose successor, Amyntas, the whole became a province, Strabo XII. 5, 1. When Deiotarus received from Pompey Lesser Armenia and the title king, he kept his tetrarchy and chieftaincy.

2. The Gauls after the victory of Attalus I (in 230 B.C.) were long under Pergamene influence, and in 189 B.C. Manlius consulted Eumenes in imposing terms

upon them, Polyb. XXI. 41 (43); but he exacted indemnities from them for Rome, Liv. XXXVIII. 18, 2; Polyb. XXI. 34; 36. He also left them so far under Eumenes's supremacy, that they were bound to keep the peace with Eumenes, and not quit their borders under arms, Liv. XXXVIII. 40, 1; Polyb. XXI. 41 (43). Manlius had to subdue the various chiefs separately.

3. When Eumenes displeased Rome, the Gauls were encouraged to assail him and accuse him to the senate, and after his victory over them, Rome stepped in and made them dependent immediately upon herself, granting them autonomy on condition of keeping within their boundaries, Polyb. XXX. 28; 30; XXXI. 1; 32 (XXXI. 2; 6; 9; XXXII. 3).

4. Their contingents constantly helped Rome in her wars in Asia, and Cicero (*Att.* VI. 5, 3) speaks of them as being the most reliable part of his auxiliaries. (51 B.C.)

We hear of the bestowal of the titles 'king' and 'friend and ally' upon a Galatian prince:

5. Diod. XXXIV. (XXXV.) 63: Κοντωνιατός τις ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς Γαλατικῆς πόλεως τῆς...Ἰοντώρας συνέσει...διάφορος ἦν, φίλος δὲ καὶ σύμμαχος Ῥωμαίων, ὡς ἂν ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις διατετριφὼς ἐν Ῥώμῃ...διὰ Ῥωμαίων δὲ παρειληφὼς τὴν ἐν Γαλατίᾳ βασιλείαν.

6. We hear too of the deposition of another prince by Murena, who joined his land to Lycia, Strabo XIII. 4, 17.

Deiotarus.

In the last century of the Republic the history of Galatia centres in Deiotarus, who for zealous service was rewarded by Pompey with the kingdom of Armenia Minor, while keeping his tetrarchy.

Clientship:

(*a*) Received his power and dignity from Rome:

7. Cic. *Deiot.* 27: multis ille quidem gradibus officiorum erga rem publicam nostram ad hoc regium nomen ascendit. Cf. Cic. *Att.* v. 17.

He was also confirmed in his tetrarchy by Pompey, App. *Mith.* 114.

8. Caesar when he took away D.'s Armenian kingdom left him the royal title, Cic. *Deiot.* 36.

Cf. *ib.* 25: a quo (Caesare) regem et se et filium suum constitutos esse meminisset.

(*b*) Services in war:

9. Cic. *Deiot.* 37: ab omnibus (sc. imperatoribus) est ornatus, qui, posteaquam in castris esse potuit per aetatem, in Asia, Cappadocia, Ponto, Cilicia, Syria bella gesserunt.

10. *ib. Phil.* XI. 33: cuius benevolentia in populum Romanum est ipsius aequalis aetati: qui non solum socius imperatorum nostrorum fuit in bellis, verum etiam dux copiarum suarum. Cf. *ib.* 34.

11. Liv. *Ep.* 94: Deiotarus, Gallograeciae tetrarches, praefectos Mithridatis bellum in Phrygia moventes cecidit.

Cf. App. *Mith.* 75; [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 68 (where Caesar is said to have 'commanded' his aid), 77. As king of Armenia, he guarded the frontier, sending Rome notice of the approach of the Parthians, Cic. *Fam.* VIII. 10, 1; *Att.* v. 21, 27. In the Civil wars he aided Pompey (*v.* n. 14 *infra*), and later Brutus and Cassius, Cic. *Phil.* II. 37.

These services were clearly those of a client, and not rendered by the terms of an alliance:

12. Cic. *Fam.* XV. 1, 6: regis Deiotari et voluntatem et copias, quantaecunque sunt, nostras esse duco. Reliqui reges...neque opibus satis firmi nec voluntate sunt.

13. Cic. *Phil.* XI. 31 : senatui placere : regem Deiotarum patrem et regem D. filium, si ut multis bellis saepenumero imperium populi Romani iuverint, item C. Cassium pro consule copiis suis opibusque iuvissent, senatui populoque Romano gratum esse facturos, itemque si ceteri reges... fecissent, S.P.Q.R. eorum officii non immemorem futurum.

14. Cic. *Deiot.* 13 (Deiotarus ad Pompeium) : venit vel rogatus ut amicus, vel arcessitus ut socius, vel evocatus ut is qui senatui parere didicisset.

15. *ib.* 9 : nunquam tu illum accusavisti ut hostem, sed ut amicum officio parum functum, quod propensior in Cn. Pompeii amicitiam fuisset quam in tuam.

16. Cf. also Deiotarus' excuse of himself in [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 67 : 'neque enim se iudicem debuisse esse controversiarum populi Romani, sed *parere praesentibus imperiis*.' It is thus a case of friendship or compulsion as subordinate, and 'socius' is applied to him as one who had so often helped Rome and had earned the title 'socius atque amicus.'

(*c*) Protected as client :

17. Defended against Pharnaces, [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 34.

Honours :

18. Cic. *Phil.* XI. 33 : quae de illo viro Sulla, quae Murena, quae Servilius, quae Lucullus, quam ornate, quam honorifice, quam graviter saepe in senatu praedicaverunt.

19. *ib. Deiot.* 37 : senatus vero iudicia de illo tam multa tamque honorifica, quae publicis populi Romani litteris monumentisque consignata sunt.

20. *ib.* 10 : is rex quum senatus hoc nomine saepe honorificentissimis decretis appellavisset.

Degraded to the position of subject :

21. [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 67 : Deiotarus, depositis regiis insignibus neque tantum privato vestitu sed etiam reorum

habitu, supplex ad Caesarem venit, oratum ut sibi ignosceret.

Put on trial:

22. Cic. *Deiot.* 1: dico pro capite fortunisque regis; quod ipsum, etsi non iniquum est, in tuo dumtaxat periculo, tamen est ita inusitatum regem capitis reum esse ut ante hoc tempus non sit auditum. Cf. Tac. *Orat.* 21, 6 (Brutus as advocate of Deiotarus).

Imitation of Roman customs:

23. Cic. *Deiot.* 27: quidquid a bellis populi Romani vacabat, cum hominibus nostris consuetudines, amicitias, res rationesque iungebat; ut non solum tetrarcha nobilis, sed optimus paterfamilias, et diligentissimus agricola et pecuarius haberetur.

24. [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 34: adiungit Cn. Domitius legioni tricesimae sextae duas ab Deiotaro quas ille disciplina atque armatura nostra complures annos constitutas habebat.

His position in Galatia:

25. In App. *Mith.* 75, 114 he is mentioned among a number of tetrarchs. With this cf. [Caes.] *Bell. Alex.* 67: Deiotarus tetrarches Gallograeciae tunc quidem paene totius, quod ei neque legibus neque moribus concessum esse ceteri tetrarchae contendebant, sine dubio autem rex Armeniae minoris ab senatu appellatus... (This contention Caesar heard later.)

Bell. Alex. 78 shews that Deiotarus had seized some time before another tetrarchy, which Caesar in 47 B.C. gave to Mithridates the Pergamene. Deiotarus seems to have aimed at absorbing all the other tetrarchies. Until Caesar cut down his territory in 47 B.C., he seems to have been regarded as supreme in Galatia. The title king, which Caesar left him, would probably cause him to rank

above the other tetrarchs, and his successor Amyntas was evidently overlord of all Galatia, Dio LIII. 26; Strabo XII. 5, 1.

Amyntas.

26. Deiotarus' son of the same name, who reigned jointly with him for some time (*v.* n. 8 *supra*), seems to have died before his father. Amyntas, a former clerk of Deiotarus, was appointed king by Antony, Strabo XII. 5, 1; Dio XLIX. 32, 3. He died in an expedition against Homonada in Cilicia, Strabo *ib.* Augustus then made Galatia a province, though Amyntas had sons, Dio LIII. 26.

XIII. COMMAGENE.

Antiochus.

1. Antiochus of Commagene, who in 68 B.C. made friendship with Lucullus[1], seems to have had the title king (Cic. *ad Qu. Fratr.* II. 10, 2: multa dixi in ignobilem regem), though Cicero frequently speaks of him without the title, contrary to his usual respectful way, and the 'praetexta' with which he was presented was generally given to 'reguli,' as distinct from the royal gift of the 'toga purpurea' (Liv. XXVII. 4, 9). Cicero (*ib.*) contemptuously makes him the inferior of a tetrarch, 'Vos autem, homines nobiles, qui Bostrenum praetextatum non ferebatis, Commagenum feretis?'

[1] The statement of Appian (*Mith.* 106) that Pompey 'made war upon Antiochus until he came to seek friendship,' is probably a mistake (*v.* Momms. *Rom. Gesch.* Bk. v. ch. 4). Pompey even trusted him with the newly conquered Mesopotamia (App. *Mith.* 114), indicating that he had remained faithful since 68 B.C.

Recognition:

2. Dio XXXVI. 2: (ὁ Λούκουλλος) *τόν τε τῆς* Κομμαγηνῆς *βασιλέα* Ἀντίοχον *καί τινα* Ἀράβιον *δυνάστην...ἐπικηρυκευσαμένους οἱ ἐδέξατο.*

Foreign policy:

3. Antiochus assumed the surname 'Φιλορώμαιος,' Bas-Waddington, *Inscript.* III. 2, n. 136 *d.*

Services to Rome:

4. Kept watch against the Parthians, and informed Cicero of their approach, Cic. *Fam.* XV. 1, 2; 3, 1; 4, 3. Aided Pompey in Civil wars, Caes. *B. C.* III. 4; 5; App. *B. C.* II. 49.

5. It was considered a breach of his clientship, when he received Parthian fugitives in 38 B.C., Plut. *Ant.* XXXIV. 2, but Antony, who went to punish him, failed to reduce him by siege, and could only impose upon him merely nominal terms of submission.

Seeks rewards for his clientship:

6. Cic. *ad Qu. Frat.* II. 10, 2: de Commageno mirifice mihi blanditur Appius. Videt enim, hoc genere dicendi si utar in ceteris, Februarium sterilem futurum. Eumque lusi iocose satis, neque solum illud extorsi oppidulum eius quod erat in Euphrati [Zeugmate], praeterea togam sum eius praetextam, quam erat adeptus Caesare consule, magno hominum risu cavillatus. 'Quod vult,' inquam, 'renovari honores eosdem, quo minus togam praetextam quotannis interpolet, decernendum nihil censeo.'

Capital punishment of a successor of the above Antiochus by Augustus:

7. Dio LII. 43, 1: *τόν τε* Ἀντίοχον *τὸν* Κομμαγηνὸν *μετεπέμψατο ὅτι τινὰ πρεσβευτὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ διαφόρου οἱ*

ὄντος σταλέντα ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐδολοφόνησε καὶ ἔς τε τὸ συνέδριον ἐσήγαγε καὶ καταψηφισθέντα ἀπέκτεινε. (29 B.C.)

XIV. Armenia.

Tigranes.

Friendship with Rome, after his defeat (66 B.C.):

1. Dio XXXVI. 52, 4: Πομπήιος δὲ (Τιγράνην) παρεμυθήσατο εἰπὼν ἄλλα τε καὶ ὅτι...τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων φιλίαν προσειληφὼς εἴη. *ib.* 53, 5 gives the enrolment of Tigranes by Pompey as friend and ally.

2. Cic. *Sest.* 59: regnat hodie (Tigranes) et amicitiae nomen ac societatis, quod armis violarat, precibus est consecutus.

Terms of peace:

3. App. *Mith.* 104: ἐδίδου Πομπηίῳ αὐτῷ τάλαντα ἑξακισχίλια, τῇ στρατιᾷ δὲ δραχμὰς πεντήκοντα ἑκάστῳ καὶ λοχαγῷ χιλίας καὶ χιλιάρχῳ μυρίας. καὶ ὁ Πομπήιος αὐτῷ συνεγίγνωσκε τῶν γεγονότων· καὶ διῄτησε τὸν μὲν υἱὸν ἄρχειν τῆς Σωφηνῆς καὶ Γορδυηνῆς...τὸν δὲ πατέρα τῆς ἄλλης Ἀρμενίας ἐπὶ τῷδε τῷ παιδὶ κληρονόμῳ.

Cf. also Plut. *Pomp.* 33; Strabo XI. p. 530; Cic. *Sest.* 38; Vell. II. 37 *inf.*; Dio XXXVI. 53. All the authorities shew clearly that the money paid by Tigranes was an indemnity (ποινὴν...τῆς ἀδικίας, Plut.), with the addition of a donative to Pompey's army.

Tigranes' sovereignty unimpaired:

4. Vell. II. 37: servatus regi honos imperii sed multato ingenti pecunia, quae omnis, sicuti Pompeio moris erat, redacta in quaestoris potestatem ac publicis descripta litteris.

Owes his sovereignty, thus restored, to Rome:

5. Cic. *Sest.* 58: hunc Cn. Pompeius...certis rebus imperatis regnare iussit, nec minus et sibi et huic imperio gloriosum putavit constitutum a se regem quam constrictum videri. Cf. Liv. *Ep.* 101.

6. Submits to arbitration in his quarrel with Parthia, App. *Mith.* 106; Dio XXXVII. 7.

Note however the motive in this case:

7. Dio XXXVII. 7: ἐκεῖνοι (sc. ὁ Τιγράνης καὶ ὁ Φραάτης) ...πάντα τὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους διελύσαντο, ὀργιζόμενος μὲν ὁ Τιγράνης ὅτι τῆς ἐπικουρίας οὐκ ἔτυχε, βουλόμενος δὲ ὁ Φραάτης περιεῖναι τὸν Ἀρμένιον...καὶ γὰρ εὖ ἠπίσταντο ἀμφότεροι, ὅτι, ὁπότερος αὐτῶν τοῦ ἑτέρου κρατήσειε, τῶν τε πραγμάτων τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις προκόψει καὶ αὐτὸς εὐχειρωτότερός σφισι γενήσεται.

8. For the refusal of Tigranes' request for aid, *v.* Dio *supra*, and cf. App. *Mith.* 106: (οἱ Τιγράνους πρέσβεις) ὡς φίλῳ συμμαχεῖν τὸν Πομπήιον ἀξιοῦντες...καὶ ὁ Πομπήιος οὐκ ἀξιῶν Παρθυαίοις πολεμεῖν ἄνευ Ῥωμαίων ψηφίσματος ἔπεμψεν ἀμφοτέροις διαλλακτάς.

Artavasdes.

Friendship with Rome:

9. Strabo XI. p. 532: διαδεξάμενος δ' Ἀρταουάσδης ἐκεῖνον τέως μὲν ηὐτύχει φίλος ὢν Ῥωμαίοις.

Services:

(*a*) To Crassus:

10. Plut. *Crass.* 19: οὐχ ἥκιστα δ' αὐτὸν Ἀρταβάζης ὁ Ἀρμενίων βασιλεὺς ἐπέῤῥωσεν. ἦλθε γὰρ εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον μεθ' ἑξακισχιλίων ἱππέων. ἑτέρους δὲ μυρίους ὑπισχνεῖτο.

Cf. Dio XL. 16, 2 (Artav.'s advice disregarded by Crassus); Plut. *Crass.* 22 (Artav. delays to operate).

(*b*) To Antony:

11. Dio XLIX. 25, 1: Antony persuaded by Artav. to attack the Median king. Cf. Strabo XI. p. 524: Ἀρταουάσδης ὃν ἐκεῖνος (sc. ὁ Ἀντώνιος)...σύμβουλον ἐποιεῖτο καὶ κύριον τῆς περὶ τοῦ πολέμου γνώμης. The war was conducted from Armenia but Artavasdes finally deserted Antony, Plut. *Ant.* 37—39.

'Evocatio' disobeyed by Artavasdes:

12. Dio XLIX. 33, 2: τὸν δ' οὖν Ἀρμένιον πρότερον μὲν ἐς τὴν Αἴγυπτον, ὡς καὶ φίλον καὶ ὡς ἐνταῦθα αὐτὸν ἀπόνως περιλαβὼν κατεργάσηται, μετεπέμψατο. ἐπεὶ δ' ὑποτοπήσας τοῦτ' οὐχ ὑπήκουσεν...

13. Antony finally secured him by cunning, and after imprisoning him for some time put him to death, Dio *ib.* 39, 6; Tac. *Ann.* II. 3, 2; Plut. *Ant.* 50; Liv. *Ep.* 131; Jos. *Ant.* XV. 104; Strabo XI. p. 532.

Antony's regard for the royal dignity:

14. Dio XLIX. 39, 6: ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἀργυραῖς ἁλύσεσιν· αἰσχρὸν γάρ, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἦν βασιλέα αὐτὸν γεγονότα σιδηραῖς δεθῆναι.

15. Armenia was then assailed by Parthian influences, seen in the institution of Artaxias as king in place of Antony's son by Cleopatra, Tac. *Ann.* II. 3; Jos. *Ant.* XV. 104; Dio XLIX. 39, 5. Augustus however drove out Artaxias and established Tigranes, Mon. Anc. 27[1].

Clientship of Armenia under the successors of Artavasdes:

16. Strabo XI. p. 532: μετ' ἐκεῖνον δὲ πλείους ἐβασίλευσαν ὑπὸ Καίσαρι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ὄντες.

[1] Later emperors, in dealing with Armenia and similar difficult regions, sometimes followed the policy of the senate of old, that namely of escorting a rival to the border and leaving him to be joined there by his faction and establish himself. Their chief care was to keep the border nations distracted and weak.

17. Mon. Anc. 27: Armeniam maiorem, interfecto rege eius Artaxe, cum possem facere provinciam, malui maiorum nostrorum exemplo regnum id Tigrani regis Artavasdis filio...tradere.

XV. Parthia.

The Parthian kings never became really dependent upon Rome:

1. Thus in the time of Sulla the reigning king protested his equality by putting to death his ambassador for suffering Sulla to take the seat of honour between himself and Ariobarzanes, Plut. *Sull.* 5.

2. His successor replied to the slights of Pompey by declaring war upon Armenia, a friend of Rome. For his motive in submitting to arbitration *v.* XIV. 7 *supra.*

Compare also

3. Lucan VIII. 230:

Solus et e numero regum telluris Eoae
Ex aequo me Parthus adit. Nec munere Magni
Stant semel Arsacidae.

4. Vell. II. 40: Mithridates ultimus omnium iuris sui regum praeter Parthicos.

The boasts of Augustus were hardly warranted by circumstances:

5. Mon. Anc. 29: Parthos trium exercituum Romanorum spolia et signa reddere mihi supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani petere.

6. *ib.* 32: ad me rex Parthorum Phrates Orodis filius filios suos nepotesque omnes misit in Italiam, non bello superatus sed amicitiam nostram per liberorum suorum pignora petens.

The king of Parthia only sought the friendship of Augustus that he might send his children to Rome out of

his way, as possible rivals to himself in the future. He did not send them as a pledge of his friendship.

XVI. Judaea.

Until 64 B.C. Rome only had dealings with the Jews so far as to respond to the requests of their successive high-priests for 'friendship' or 'friendship and alliance,' Jos. *Ant.* XIII. 163, 164, 259 etc. The first active interference of Rome in Judaean affairs was in 64—63 B.C. when Pompey restored Hyrcanus as high priest. This Hyrcanus and Herod the Great are the only two Judaean rulers that concern us.

Hyrcanus[1].

The settlement of Pompey in 63 B.C. practically converted Judaea into a province. It was at any rate subordinated to the governor of Syria, almost as an 'attributa regio.' Thus

(*a*) Hyrcanus lost the royal name and dignity and received back simply the priesthood, Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 73, 90 f.

(*b*) Tribute was levied from the Jews, not from Hyrcanus as ruler, Jos. *Bell.* I. 154; *Ant.* XIV. 74 f.; Dio XXXIX. 56, 6.

(*c*) An aristocratic government was set up:

Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 91: *...πέντε δὲ συνέδρια καταστήσας,...καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπηλλαγμένοι τῆς δυναστείας ἐν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ διῆγον.*

ib. Bell. I. 170: *ἀσμένως δὲ τῆς ἐξ ἑνὸς ἐπικρατείας ἐλευθερωθέντες τὸ λοιπὸν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ διῳκοῦντο.*

[1] This section is inserted to shew that Hyrcanus, though the successor of rulers who assumed the royal title, and predecessor of King Herod, must be placed upon a different footing from that of the kings treated in this essay. Bohn's remarks on the position of the Jews during this period were found of great assistance.

(*d*) The capital jurisdiction was probably controlled by the Syrian governor:

Ammianus XIV. 8, 12: ultima Syriarum est Palaestina; has quoque regiones Pompeius...in provincias rectori delata iurisdictione formavit (MSS. have 'provincias reciem delata aurisdictione').

(*e*) The right of coinage seems to have been taken away, for though a number of coins are extant belonging to former and later periods, none are forthcoming from this period.

(*f*) The governors of Syria constantly interfered in the internal control of the nation, and treated it as part of their 'provincia.' Thus i. Pompey seems to have included it in that of Scaurus, Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 79. ii. Gabinius besides his other acts rebuilt cities in Judaea, *ib.* 87. iii. Crassus, on his way to Parthia, visited Judaea as part of his 'provincia' and interfered in many matters, *ib.* 119. iv. Cassius took a city of Judaea and enslaved certain seditious inhabitants, and also punished other rebels at the request of Hyrcanus and his minister Antipater, *ib.* 120.

(*g*) Hyrcanus was likewise forbidden to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. It was to be as accessible to Roman intervention as the rest of Judaea, *ib.* 82, 144, 146.

Hyrcanus as high priest still dictated to the Jews in all religious matters, and his sphere would be wide amid such a religious nation. His minister in temporal matters, Antipater, acted as subordinate of the Syrian governor, *ib.* 101, and at Hyrcanus' order furnished him with corn and money, *ib.* 80 (Scaurus), 99 (Gabinius), 127—136 (Mithridates of Pergamum when sent by Caesar).

Caesar however in 47 B.C. (*a*) restored to Hyrcanus

much of his power with the title 'ethnarch[1].' He was to 'bear rule over the nation of the Jews,' *ib.* 151, 194, 314, 317.

(*b*) Allowed him in accordance with this power to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, and 'retain it in the manner he himself pleased,' *ib.* 146, 199.

(*c*) Restored him full criminal jurisdiction, and confirmed his jurisdiction in religious matters and Jewish customs; *ib.* 177: trial of Herod by Hyrcanus. For his religious jurisdiction *v.* § 195.

(*d*) Set up Antipater as dynast of Judaea under Hyrcanus, and gave him and his sons the governorship of the nation. The governor of Syria did not now intervene, *ib.* 143. Antipater's subordination to Hyrcanus appears in §§ 157, 162, 168.

(*e*) Hyrcanus' restoration however did not bring to the Jews freedom from tribute[2], but this tribute was still paid by them separately, not by Hyrcanus as their ruler. Moreover Caesar specially confirmed Hyrcanus' power to receive the sacred tithes as before, *ib.* 203. He also gave him control of his tariffs, *ib.* 249.

(*f*) Caesar also granted him protection by letters to the cities and kings, guaranteeing the integrity of his territory. Hyrcanus was therefore under Rome's protec-

[1] Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 117 gives the power of an ethnarch: 'he governs the nation, and takes care of their contracts and the laws to them belonging, as if he were ruler of a free republic.'

Hyrcanus was called by his people 'king' even after 63 B.C. (*ib.* 156, 165, 172), but he was only recognised by Rome as ethnarch.

[2] Jos. *Ant. ib.* 202: Caesar merely regulates the tribute, with such alleviations as (i) exemption during the Sabbatic year, (ii) exemption from the taxfarming system, the Jews having to pay it in at Sidon, (iii) a variation in the tribute, when the crops are bad, since it depends on and is calculated by the crops. Cf. also Part II in this Essay, § 75.

tion in his foreign relations, so far as he had any, but this very act of protection shews that he enjoyed the dignity of a ruler, and was not under the Roman provincial governor, *ib.* 147, 148.

(*g*) As the ruler of a nation not within the Roman 'provincia,' he was to have for his land freedom from military exactions in the way of auxiliaries or money, *ib.* 195, 204. A Roman commander could march through his land and encamp there as ally, but the expenses were not to be borne by the Jews, nor could they be enlisted against their will.

(*h*) He received the privilege of kings in respect of the treatment of his envoys, *ib.* 210.

It was a special concession to Jewish custom when Caesar granted that the high priesthood should be confirmed to his sons also, and not pass out of the priestly family, *ib.* 194.

The clientship of Hyrcanus in all these departments of his sovereignty as ethnarch is manifest. He received everything from Rome, in several separate decrees.

The help which Hyrcanus rendered to Rome in her wars, as client, would be given through his ministers in temporal matters, Antipater and his sons.

Though Caesar so far restored Hyrcanus to the rulership of the nation, the following facts remain to shew that Rome still dealt largely with the Jewish people itself, as after the Pompeian settlement:

(*a*) the mention of the Jews as friends or allies in several decrees, along with Hyrcanus, Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 207, 214, 216;

(*b*) the bestowal of the citizenship of Rome on many Jews. These were specially exempted from service on account of their religious views about the Sabbath, *ib.* 228, 232, 234–5, 237, 240;

(*c*) the payment of tribute by the Jews to Rome, besides the sacred tribute which they paid to Hyrcanus.

The relations of Hyrcanus were thus less personal than those of the kings. He was ethnarch, *i.e.* according to Josephus (XIV. 117) 'ruler of a free republic.'

Herod.

Herod appears first as an independent ruler with the name of tetrarch, which he received from Antony. From the time when this title was given to him and to his brother Phaselus, the high-priesthood declined rapidly in authority and lost its temporal power.

In 41 B.C. the Parthians drove out Herod, and took away captive Hyrcanus. Herod went to Rome for help and returned a king.

1. Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 385: (Antony) ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς (the senate) ὡς καὶ πρὸς τὸν κατὰ Πάρθων πόλεμον Ἡρώδην βασιλεύειν συμφέρει, καὶ δόξαν τοῦτο πᾶσι ψηφίζονται. Confirmed later in his kingdom by Augustus, *ib.* XV. 200.

Herod's surprise at his fortune:

2. *ib.* XIV. 386: οὐ γὰρ ἐνόμιζεν αὐτῷ τοὺς Ῥωμαίους παρέξειν, τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ γένους ἔθος ἔχοντας αὐτὴν διδόναι.

In Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 386 it is stated that for the above reason Herod had not requested the honour, but in § 382 he is said to have bribed Antony to propose it.

Protected by Rome as client:

3. Received Roman contingents to serve under him and assist him, *ib.* 394, 410. A Roman legion remained to support him for some time after he had established himself in Judaea, *ib.* XV. 72. His opponent Antigonus was beheaded by Antony, *ib.* XV. 9.

Services to Rome:

4. At his appointment it was understood that he was to assist Rome, *v.* 1 *supr.* For instances of such assist-

ance cf. *ib.* XIV. 420; XV. 109. Herod was even sent by Antony against Arabia at the prompting of Cleopatra, *ib.* XV. 109 f.

'Evocatio,' summons to render account of his conduct:

5. *ib.* XV. 64: Ἀντώνιος πέμπει κελεύων Ἡρώδην ἐλθόντα τῶν εἰς Ἀριστόβουλον ἀπολύσασθαι.

Independence in his internal government:

6. *ib.* XV. 76: οὐ γὰρ ἔφη (sc. ὁ Ἀντώνιος) καλῶς ἔχειν... βασιλέα περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν γεγενημένων εὐθύνας ἀπαιτεῖν· οὕτως γὰρ ἂν οὐδὲ βασιλεὺς εἴη· δόντας δὲ τὴν τιμὴν καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας καταξιώσαντας ἐᾶν αὐτῇ χρῆσθαι.

(Herod however made Antony great presents.)

7. Appointed and deposed high-priests, *ib.* XV. 22, 39. Settled his own revenues, *ib.* 365; XVI. 64; XVII. 317. Developed and improved his kingdom, *ib.* XIV. 136–149.

8. His condition under Augustus was much the same, but his homage was accentuated. He thus consulted Augustus before putting his sons on trial, whereupon Augustus allowed him to decide about them as he thought fit, *ib.* XVI. 90, 98, 99. This permission Herod felt it more necessary perhaps to secure, since he had already commended them to the 'princeps' as his future heirs, *ib.* XV. 343. So likewise he tried Antipater with the governor of Syria as his assessor, and waited for Augustus' sanction of the condemnation, *ib.* XVII. 89, 145. He had however power to put them to death himself, *ib.* XVI. 98, 99.

9. He was not allowed to make war without Augustus' consent. He fell into disgrace on an alleged offence of having attacked Arabia, *ib.* XVI. 284. The king of that country however had relations with Rome. Herod could maintain order on his borders, but even to repress robbers he needed the Syrian governor's permission when they were outside his own land, *ib.*

10. His will had to be sanctioned by Augustus, *ib.* XVII. 195, 202, though Herod had previously obtained permission to settle the succession as he liked, *ib.* XV. 343; XVI. 129. His successor could not take the title king until Augustus gave it him, *ib.* XVII. 195, 202.

The above details are sufficient to shew that with one master instead of many the king became far more dependent and responsible than he was under the senate's rule.

APPENDIX B[1].

Evidence of bribery of individual Romans by the client-kings :

1. Cic. *Frag. B.* XVI. iii. 2 : non patiar hanc exaudiri vocem huius imperii, ego te, nisi das aliquid, hostem, si quid dederis, regem et socium et amicum iudicabo.

2. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 98 : cum omnem pecuniam...ex vectigalibus redegissetis, ab omnibus regibus...coegissetis.

3. Cic. *Fam.* I. 9, 7 : tota interrogatio mea nihil habuit nisi reprehensionem illius tribunatus ; in quo omnia dicta...de vi, de auspiciis, de donatione regnorum.

4. Cic. *Att.* II. 9, 1 : improbitate istorum qui...regna, qui praedia tetrarchis, qui immanis pecunias paucis dederunt.

5. Cic. *Dom.* 129 : uno tempore...foedera feriebantur provinciarum, regum appellationes venales erant... Reges appellati a populo qui id nunquam ne a senatu quidem postulassent.

6. Cic. *Vat.* 29 speaks of the plundering of the treasury by Vatinius, and of his making foedera with kings and tetrarchs.

7. Cic. *Milo*, 73 : eum (sc. Clodium) qui regna dedit, ademit.

[1] The majority of the passages in this Appendix were taken from a collection made by Prof. Reid, of which he kindly allowed me the use.

8. Cic. *Sest.* 66: qui locus orbi terrae iam (58 B.C.) non erat alicui destinatus? quae regio orave terrarum erat latior, in qua non regnum aliquod statueretur? quis autem rex erat, qui illo anno non aut emendum sibi, quod non habebat, aut redimendum, quod habebat, arbitraretur?

9. Cic. *Har. Resp.* 58: reges qui erant, vendidit, qui non erant, appellavit (Clodius).

The practice was very general among all parties:

10. Caes. *B. C.* I. 4: Lentulus...regum appellandorum largitionibus movetur.

11. Cic. *Quint. Frat.* II. 10, 2 mentions Appius' expectations of presents from the kings who sent in requests to the senate, as for instance Antiochus of Commagene.

Antony made huge sums from this traffic, while yet in Rome, and later in Asia:

12. Cic. *Phil.* v. 11, 12: decreta falsa vendebat, regna...in aes accepta pecunia iubebat incidi...Foedera facta; regna data...Quibus rebus tanta pecunia una in domo coacervata est.

13. Dio XLVIII. 24: *τάς τε πόλεις ἠργυρολόγει καὶ τὰς δυναστείας ἐπίπρασκε.*

Herod is a special instance; Jos. *Ant.* XIV. 382.

The practice in an earlier period:

14. Diod. XXX.—XL. 13 (supplement, Teubner): *ὁ Τίμαρχος* (sc. *Δημητρίου σατράπης*) *εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἐξαπεσταλμένος πρεσβευτὴς πολλὰ κακὰ διεργάσατο τὴν σύγκλητον· χρημάτων γὰρ πλῆθος κομίζων, ἐδωροδόκει τοὺς συγκλητικοὺς καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς τοῖς βίοις ἀσθενεῖς.*

TABLE OF REFERENCES TO DIODORUS

The following table contains passages which we have quoted from Diodorus, as they appear in the editions of Bekker (Leipsic, 1853) and Dindorf (Paris, 1844).

	Bekker	Dindorf
Diod.	xxiii. 6	xxiii. 4
	xxv. 19	xxv. 14
	xxvi. 24	xxvi. 15
	xxvii. 11	xxvii. 8
	xxix. 25	xxix. 22
	,, 33	,, 30
	,, 36	,, 33
	xxxi. 10	xxxi. 7
	,, 11	,, 8
	,, 28	,, 19
	,, 39	,, 28
	,, 41	,, 30
	,, 44	,, 33
	xxxii. 1–4	xxxii. 1–4
	,, 11	,, 10
	,, 17	,, 17
	,, 20	,, 20
	xxxiii. 20	xxxiii. 17
	,, 21	,, 18
	xxxiv. (xxxv.) 63	xxxiv. (xxxv.) 36
	,, 66	,, 39
	xxxvi. 1	xxxvi. 3

INDEX

The numbers refer to pages

Abdera, 100
Abrupolis, K. of Thrace, 184, 184 n.
Achaean league, offended by R., 92
Adherbal, K. of Numidia, clientship, 96, 154, 156, 178, 179; friendship and alliance, 23; death, 179
Adoption, 78, 79
Aedui, 26, 111, 154 n.
Aetolians, 55, 188
Agrarian law, 84, 85, 137, 147, 148
Agrippa II, Herod, arranges meeting of kings, 91 n.
Agrippa, M., 140; action in Bosporus, 211; slays Bogud, 181
Alexander Balas, becomes k. of Syria, 82, 194, 195; recognised by R., 81, 194; friendship and alliance, 16
Alexander the Great, sovereignty of, 63; successors of, 61, 62 n.
Alliance, meaning and nature of, 11, 13–48, 107–112; duration of, 66, 67; temporary, 11, 24, 38, 47, 54; renewal of, *see* Friendship and *Foedus*
Amicitia, 1–48, *see also* Friendship; *a. paterna*, 14, 16, 25, 59
Amyntas, K. of Galatia, 142, 211, 216; coinage of, 121
Andriscus, 194
Annexation, 83–88, 142, 143–151; of Cyprus, 173; of Numidia, 180
Antigonus, K. of Jews, 141, 226
Antiochus I, K. of Commagene, clientship of, 76, 145, 216, 217; friendship, 37; 'Philorhomaios,' 90; receives 'toga praetexta,' 75, 76, 138
Antiochus II (son of preceding), put to death, 119
Antiochus Philopappus, 69, 142
Antiochus III, K. of Syria, alleged attack upon Attalus I, 185 n.; arbitration in dispute with Eumenes, 190; designs upon Egypt, 5, 165; friendship with R., 13, 28, 37, 66 n.; friendship and alliance, 27; treaty with R., 13, 51, 52, 55, 66 n., 93, 190
Antiochus IV, seizes kingdom, 4, 191; clientship and independence, 51, 52, 91, 93, 101, 191–193; origin of clientship, 4, 52; professions of clientship, 58, 103, 153; friendship, 37, 58; friendship and alliance, 13, 16; helped by Eumenes II, 188; imitates Roman customs, 193; war with Egypt, 5, 6
Antiochus V, succeeds to throne, 80, 193; murdered, 193

Antiochus XIII, established by Lucullus and deposed by Pompey, 18, 85, 87, 196
Antiochus, prince of Syria, friendship and alliance, 17, 21, 195
Antipater, dynast of Judaea, 136, 225, 226
Antonius, M., action in Armenia, 217; in Egypt, 116, 126; in Media, 34; exacts contributions from kings, 136, 138; friendship with Herod, 140; makes kings, 73, 134, 207; supports Herod, 33, 118, 134, 138, 226; takes bribes, 230; treatment of kings, 141, 142
Appellatio, 58–61, 71–73
Aquillius, M'., 99, 199, 204
Arbitration, 52, 56, 77–80, 95–100; between Carthage and Numidia, 175, 176; Philip and Attalus I, 185; Eumenes and the Gauls, 186; Eum. and Antiochus, 186, 190; Eum. and Prusias I, 186; Eum. and Pharnaces, 187; Attalus II and Prusias II, 189; Jugurtha and Adherbal, 179
Archelaus of Comana, made king, 88, 207
Archelaus, general of Mithridates VI, 41 n.
Archelaus, Herod, refuses title 'king,' 68, 87; independence, 117 n.; banished, 87, 119
Ἀρχὴ πατρῴα, 79
Aretas, K. of Arabia, 86
Ariarathes IV, K. of Cappadocia, clientship and independence, 93, 200, 201; origin of clientship, 3; friendship, 15, 30, 37; alliance with Eumenes, 92 n., 188, 200
Ariarathes V (son of preceding), clientship and independence, 100, 101, 139, 201–203; friendship, 15, 30; friendship and alliance, 15, 18, 30; goodwill, 15; breaks off relations with Demetrius I, 82, 194, 202; loses half his kingdom, 77, 80; trust in Roman protection, 59; visit to R., 201; sends son to R., 59; death in R.'s service, 113
Ariarathes, brother of Ariobarzanes III, 206
Ariobarzanes I, K. of Cappadocia, elected king, 203; clientship, 111, 203, 204; friendship and alliance, 35; 'Philorhomaios,' 89
Ariobarzanes II, recognition and death, 204
Ariobarzanes III, called king, 69; clientship, 111, 156, 205–207; friendship and alliance, 17; finances of, 132; owes money to Pompey and Brutus, 116, 132; receives bodyguard, 18, 156
Aristonicus, 113
Artabanus, K. of Parthia, 31
Artavasdes, K. of Armenia, clientship, 29, 126, 219; friendship, 29; contributes money, 133; in captivity, 141
Artaxias I, K. of Armenia, 202; friendship with Eumenes, 188; with Attalus II, 189
Artaxias II, K. of Armenia, 220
Asander, K. of Bosporus, 210, 211
Astypalaeans, treaty with, 55, 67
Attalus I, K. of Pergamum, alliance with R., 16, 54, 184, 185; friendship and goodwill, 16, 25, 29, 37, 38; independence and clientship, 3, 139, 184, 185
Attalus II, clientship and independence, 93, 96, 97, 188–190; friendship, 13, 15; friendship and alliance, 36; alliance with Ariarathes V, 92 n., 203; helps Balas, 90; helps Nicomedes, 96, 198; visit to R., 59, 188; offered part of Eumenes' kingdom, 80, 188
Attalus III, clientship, 139, 190; cruelty to subjects, 157; bequest to R., 6, 123, 146, 150, 190
Augustus, Octavian, policy of, 68,

79, 86, 87, 97, 114, 115, 118, 119, 142, 151, 152, 157, 181, 216, 221, 227, 228; friendship with Herod, 140; receives presents from Herod, 136
Auxilia regia, 122, 144

Balance of power, 98
Balas, K. of Syria, *see* Alexander
Βασιλεία, 63
Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, 73, 135, 141, 142
Bastarnae, friendship with Philip and Perseus, 183, 184
Benevolentia of kings, 109
Bequest of kingdoms, 6, 53, 62, 83, 122–124, 145–150; of Pergamum, its effect, 6, 102
Bituitus, 126
Bocchus I, K. of Mauretania, clientship, 109, 180, 181; origin of clientship, 6, 7; friendship of R. as reward, 17, 23, 24, 28; friendship and alliance, 23; enrolled as ally, 34; successors of, 181
Bocchus II, clientship, 181; friendship, 29
Bodyguard for kings, 18, 156
Bogud, K. of Mauretania, clientship, 93, 181; friendship, 29; friendship with Caesar, 140
Bomilcar, 120
Bosporan kings, peculiar position of, 73, 135, 157; assume title 'Philokaisar,' 90 n.; title 'king of kings,' 73; subject to Mithridates VI, 209
Bribes, 116, 133, 137, 138, 229, 230
British policy in India, 8 n., 159–162
Brogitarus, called king, 69, 138
Brutus, M., creditor of Ariobarzanes, 116, 136

Caesar, C. Jul., action in Africa, 180, 181; in Asia Minor, 79, 94, 132, 133, 213, 215; in Cappadocia, 206; in Egypt, 77, 116, 123, 126, 172; in Gaul, 118, 130; in Judaea, 6, 74, 117, 223–225; at the court of Nicomedes III, 199; dealings with Ariovistus, 22, 76, 126; friendship with kings, 139, 140; helps kings, 112, 136, 155 n.; intrigues to secure Egypt as province, 115; reply to Deiotarus, 106; sale of alliances and titles, 20, 137
Caesarion, 'king of kings,' 73
Campanians, treaty with, 66 n.
Cantonments in kingdoms, 160
Cappadocians, special privilege of, 29, 30
Carthage, forbidden to make war, 52, 93, 94, 95, 112; helped by Hiero, 90; treaty with R., 56
Cassianum foedus, 55
Cassius, C., 109, 136, 207
Catamantaloedes, K. of Sequani, 21
Cato, M. Porc. (Maior), 152
Cato, M. Porc. (Minor), action in Cyprus, 84, 141, 150, 174; friendship with Deiotarus, 139; rebukes Juba I, 140
Catulus, Q., 147
Chians, 118, 120
Chieftains of Spain, etc., position of, 123
Cicero, M. Tull., action in Cappadocia, 18, 91, 128, 205, 206; friendship with Deiotarus, 139; opinion upon Ptolemy Alexander's will, 146–148; protest against corruption, 137
Claudius, Emperor, reads letter to Seleucus, 32; revives ceremonial, 72
Cleopatra, clientship, 139, 172, 173, 227; enrolled as friend and ally, 39 n.; 'evocatio' of, 126
Clientship, defined, 1; professions of, 58, 59, 103, 113, 153, 154
Clodius, P., 84, 137, 138, 229, 230
Coinage, 120–122

Commissions, 53, 60 n., 82, 96, 100–103; to Antiochus IV, 192; to Egypt, 168, 169; to Eumenes, 187; to Seleucus, 191
Commius, K. of Atrebates, 118, 130
Contoniatus, of Galatia, 28; called king, 69, 138, 212
Corn, supplies of, *see* War (contributions)
Coson, chieftain of Thrace, 121
Cottius, K. in the Alps, 69 n., 115
Cotys, K. in Thrace, 100
Crassus, M., 106, 135, 146 n.
Crete, friendship with Attalus, 189; with Eumenes, 188; with Ptolemy VI, 168
Crowns, as gifts, 96, 138, 139
Curio, C., 85

Dediticius, 126
Deiotarus I, tetrarch of Galatia, clientship, 95, 106, 111, 132, 212–215; called king, 61, 69, 138 n.; contributes money, 132, 136; friendship with R., 19; friendship and alliance, 18, 19; friendship with individual Romans, 139, 140; military forces, 110; position in Galatia, 211, 215; put on trial, 142; services to R., 109, 110
Deiotarus II (son of preceding), reigns jointly with his father, 69, 216
Demagogues, influence and policy of, 83, 84, 85, 87, 147
Demetrius I, seizes throne of Syria, 81, 193; as hostage, 52; friendship promised to, 17; friendship with Ariarathes V, 202; refused recognition, 68, 74, 139, 194; supports Orophernes, 202; death, 194
Demetrius II, seizes Syrian throne, 195; expelled by Tryphon, *ib.*
Demetrius, son of Philip V, 124
Denarius, 122
Diadem, 74
Diadochi, 61, 62, 120
Diagylis, 93, 190
Dominium, 113, 117, 128, 148, 149, 154
Dynamis, queen of Pontus, 211
Dynastes provinciae, 114, 115, 118, 136

Edeco, chief of Edetani, 16
Enrolment on *formulae*, 34, 35, 39–44
Ἔνσπονδοι, 118
Equites, influence of, 145, 146
Ethnarch, power of, 224 n.
Eumenes II, K. of Pergamum, clientship and independence, 92, 93, 96, 101, 113, 153, 185–188; growth of clientship, 3; alliance with Ariarathes IV, 90; friendship with R., 16, 23, 27 n., 37; helps Antiochus IV, 90; over-lord of Galatia, 3, 92; suspected by R., 187, 212; visits R., 124, 187
Ἔθνοια, 16
Evocatio, 57, 125, 126; of Cleopatra, 173; of Jugurtha, 179
Externus rex, 32, 210
Extortion, laws upon, 115, 116

Fasces, sign of overlordship, 116, 116 n.
Februarius sterilis, 217
Fetiales, 72
Flamininus, T. Quinct., 196
Foederati populi, 115, 118, 120, 127, 128
Foedus, duration of, 53, 63, 65, 66, 70; formalities of, 71, 72, 74; sale of, 137, 138; terms of, 20, 49–56, 107, 110, 113; *f. et amicitia*, 23, 24, 31, 71
Formula amicorum, etc., 40–44
Freedom of people in annexed kingdoms, 149, 150
Friendship, as reward, 17, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30; duration of, 65–67; renewal of, 25, 58, 63, 123, 124; of kings with R., 13–48; of k. with one another,

89–91; with Greeks, 90; with individual Romans, 139, 140; Roman f. paramount, 88

Gabinius, A., condemned for extortion, 116; leaves troops in Egypt, 171
Gaditanian treaty, 54, 55
Gallus, C., commissioner, 101
Gauls, subject to Eumenes II, 3, 92, 186, 187 n., 211, 212; freed from rule of Eumenes, 187, 212; clients of R., 100, 101, 202, 211
Gelo, of Syracuse, reigns jointly with Hiero, 64; marriage of, 90
Gentius, K. of Illyria, 141
Gifts, 75, 76; significance of, 75; g. of territory, 112, 113; tenure of given territory, 113
Gordyene, King of, buried by Lucullus, 35
Gracchus, C., 149
Gracchus, Tib. (Maior), commission of, 101
Gulussa of Numidia, 36

Hannibal, 196
Ἡγεμονία, 8 n., 102, 152, 169
Hermodorus, 41
Herod the Great, as tetrarch, 226; made king, 6, 156, 226; clientship, 6, 33, 95, 97, 113, 126, 156, 226–228; independence, 92, 117–119; friendship with R., 33; friendship with Antony and Augustus, 140; bribes Antony, 138; contributes money, 136; control of Idumaea, 134; finances of, 129, 133, 133 n.; marriages of, 91
Hiarbas, of Numidia, 87, 179
Hiempsal II, K. of Numidia, clientship, 179; recognised as king, 87; friendship with R., 20; attempts to secure 'foedus,' 113; excepted in scheme of Rullus, 179
Hiero, K. of Syracuse, clientship, 89, 112, 163; origin of clientship, 1, 2; independence, 90, 165; friendship with R., 15, 25, 38; friendship and alliance, 26, 35, 36; friendship with other states, 90; treaty with R., 49, 58, 163; contributes money, etc., 135; services to R., 107, 108; visits R., 124
Hieronymus, 108, 164
High priests of Judaea, 33
Hortensius, Q., 147
Hospitium paternum, 139, 140
Hostages, 51
Ὑπήκοοι, 8 n., 106 n., 118
Hyrcanus, position in Judaea, 117, 222–226; contributes money, etc., 136; sends a crown to Antony, 139; taken captive by Parthians, 226

Idumaea, 134, 134 n.
Ilion, remission of its tribute by Seleucus, 32
Illyria, infant king of, 37; treaty with, 54
Immunis civitas, 118, 127, 128, 130
Imperium of kings and magistrates, 67–69, 129; *imp. Romanorum*, 114, 115
Indemnity, 49–53, 130, 131 n.
India, British protectorate of, 8 n., 159–162
In fide populi Romani, 5, 88
Internal affairs of kingdoms, *see* Kings

Jews, position of, 6, 33, 121, 134, 222–226; friendship and alliance, 6, 14, 92, 222; subjection of, 6, 222; coinage, 121; tribute, 129, 134
Juba I, K. of Numidia, clientship and independence, 92, 140, 179, 180; proposed recognition of, 22, 86, 137; arrogance of, 140; friendship with Pompey, 140; quarrel with Curio, 179
Juba II, K. of Mauretania, 117 n., 151, 181

Judas of Galilee, 129
Jugurtha, befriended by Scipio, 178; clientship and war with R., 96, 120, 126, 141, 155, 159 n., 178, 179
Iunctae dextrae, 75 n.
Jurisdiction of kings, *see* Kings
Ius cognationis, 79
Ius postliminii, 115
Ius Romanorum, 128, 129

King, title, *see Rex*; king of kings, 73, 135, 141, 142
Kingdoms, annexation of, 147–151; partition of, 78, 160; subject population of, 61–65, 118, 119, 149, 150, 156, 157; taxation of, 129, 130, *see also* Tribute
Kings, absence from kingdoms, and visits to Rome, 124, 125; bequests, 122–124; coinage, 120–122; control of forces, 122; dignity, 87, 116, 126, 140–142; foreign policy, 88–110, 151, 152; internal affairs, 114–125, 132, 156, 157; jurisdiction and legislation, 118–120; loans to, 116, 132; marriages, 89, 90; ownership of land, 113, 117, 128, 148, 154; philhellenism, 90, 184, 193, 203, 204; privileges and honours, 140, 141; put on trial, 141, 142; receive bodyguards, 18, 156; receive Roman citizenship, 142; restored, 18, 85, 87, 130, 131; treatment as captives, 141, 142; tribute-free, 127–139; *see also* Alliance, Friendship, etc.
Kingship, ancient, 61–65, 77–81, 118; k. of Attalids, 61 n.; k. of Ptolemies and Seleucids, 62 n.; Roman conception of, 67, 68, 70; joint reigns, 64, 69

Lampsaceni, 41 n.
Land-tenure, *see Dominium*
Latins, treaty with, 55, 66, 67
Legislation of kings, 118–120
Lepidus, M., supposed guardianship of Ptolemy V, 74, 166
Liberi populi, 114, 115, 127, 128, 136, 137; *civitas l.*, 117 n.; *civitas sine foedere l.*, 120, 128; meaning of term *l.*, 149, 150
Loans to kings, 116, 132
Lucullus, L., 85, 87, 104, 139, 216, 217

Machares, made king of Bosporus, 209; clientship, 139, 209; friendship, 35, 37
Magistrates, corruption of, 99, 106
Maiestas populi Romani, 23 n., 54, 152, 204
Malchus, king of Nabathaei, 110
Mandonius, Spanish chief, 133 n.
Manlius, Cn., action in Galatia, 92, 112, 186, 212; in Cappadocia, 200
Marcellus, C., 86
Marius, C., 105, 199
Masinissa, K. of Numidia, clientship and independence, 89, 94, 95, 112, 113, 117, 123, 124, 153, 174–177; origin of clientship, 2; alleged disloyalty, 105; called king, 47, 60, 60 n., 70; alliance with R., 26, 28; friendship, 28, 29, 34, 37, 38; entrusts division of kingdom to Scipio, 59, 69, 123; receives gifts, 75; services to Rome, 108, 110
Massiva, 120
Mastanabal, king of Numidia, 135
Maximus, Q. Fab., 105
Memmius, C., 137
Metellus, Q. Caec., 23
Micipsa, K. of Numidia, clientship, 89, 108, 153, 177; coinage, 121; promises contributions, 135
Mithrabarzanes, K. of Sophene, 203
Mithradates, K. of Parthia, 35
Mithridates, K. of Armenia, 188

Mithridates, K. of Paphlagonia, 13
Mithridates the Pergamene, made king of Bosporus, 95, 210, 215; aids Caesar, 136
Mithridates V, K. of Pontus, clientship and independence, 4, 207; friendship with R., 37
Mithridates VI (son of preceding), independence of, 4, 5, 104, 208, 209, 221; friendship and alliance, 13 n., 36, 59; voted 'ally,' 35; action in Cappadocia, 203, 204; attacked by Nicomedes, 93, 199; coinage, 121; control of Bosporus, 209; ignores Roman prohibition, 94, 99; offers to pay tribute, 130
Murena, L., 99; action in Galatia, 212

Nabis, K. of Sparta, 25
Nero, Emperor, 115
Nicomedes II, K. of Bithynia, sent to R., 198; clientship of, 198, 199
Nicomedes III (son of preceding), clientship of, 105, 199; bequest to R., 147, 148, 200; owes money to Aquillius, 99
Nike, statues of, 138

Octavius, Cn., commission of, 101, 125, 193, 202; murder of, 193
Ollovico, K. of Nitiobriges, 21
Onesimus, 41
Orobazus, 204
Orophernes, receives half Cappadocia, 77, 80, 202; driven out, 203
Oropiis, senatus consultum de, 41

Parthian kings, independence of, 7, 208, 221, 222; friendship with R., 13, 29, 31, 37, 38, 39; friendship and alliance, 35; submit to Roman arbitration, 219
Pergamenes, decree of, 190
Perseus, K. of Macedon, clientship and independence, 183, 184; temporary submission of, 47; friendship with R., 25, 26, 58; position of, 50, 51; imprisonment of, 141; loses title 'king,' 70
Phanagoreans, 210
Pharnaces, K. of Bosporus, clientship and position of, 139, 145, 209, 210, 210 n.; enrolled as friend and ally, 36, 39 n.; 'rex externus,' 32; attacks Pontus, 210
Pharnaces, K. of Pontus, wars upon Eumenes, 187, 188, 207; rejects Roman hegemony, *ib.*
Philhellenism of kings, 90, 184, 193, 203, 204
Philip V, K. of Macedon, designs upon Egypt, 5, 165; treaty with R., 50, 55, 124, 182; independence of, *ib.*; pays indemnity, 130; friendship with R., 25, 28; voted ally, 35; cooperates with R., 182; dispute with Attalus I, 185; rejects Roman hegemony, 3, 4
Φιλοκαῖσαρ, 90 n.
Φιλορώμαιος, 89, 90
Φόρος, 131 n.
Phraates, K. of Parthia, 221; friendship, 37, 38, 39; friendship and alliance, 35, 39
Phrygia, Greater, 113
Piso the Aquitanian, ancestor of, 21
Πίστις, 28
Polemo, K. of Pontus, 39 n., 40, 115, 142, 211
Polybius, 41 n.
Pompeius, Cn., action in Armenia, 38, 73, 141; in Judaea, 6, 33, 134, 134 n.; settlement of Asia, 41, 125, 131, 138, 144, 145, 204, 209, 210; treatment of Parthia, 7; of Syria, 8, 18, 85, 87, 196; refuses aid to Tigranes, 112, 155 n.; summons kings to help, 106, 135, 136; supports Ptolemy XI,

137; creditor of Ariobarzanes III, 116, 206; friendships with kings, 139, 140
Porsena, K. of Etruria, friendship with R., 29, 38; friendship and alliance, 34; receives gifts, 75 n.
Postliminium, 115
Pothinus, 126
Priene, appeals to R., 203
Princeps, position of, compared with that of R. in Mediterranean, 152
Procuratores, 116
Protectorate, British, in India, 159–162; Roman, growth of, 1–8; self-interested, 7, 8, 45, 46, 78, 93, 99, 100, 111, 154–162; value of, 64, 111, 112, 155–158; R.'s obligations, 7, 8, 95–100, 110–112, 154, 155; R. as 'princeps,' 152
Provincia, 114, 115, 144 n.
Prusias I, K. of Bithynia, clientship of, 96, 196; origin of clientship, 3; friendship with R., 25, 38
Prusias II (son of preceding), clientship of, 102, 112, 153, 197, 198; friendship and alliance, 16, 25; cruelty of rule, 157; sends son to R., 59; visits R., 124
Ptolemy, K. of Cyprus, 21, 141, 173; refused recognition, 84, 137
Ptolemy Apion, K. of Cyrene, bequest to Rome, 147, 148, 174
Ptolemy II, K. of Egypt, friendship with R., 25, 36, 165; tries to reconcile R. and Carthage, 165
Ptolemy IV, friendship with R., 37; tries to reconcile R. and Philip, 165
Ptolemy V, guardians of, 165; dealings with Antiochus III, 5, 165; friendship with R., 37; supposed acts of clientship, 166; under supposed guardianship of Lepidus, 5, 166
Ptolemy VI Philometor, clientship of, 167–169; independence of, 83, 104, 168; origin of clientship, 5, 6; friendship with R., 15, 26, 37, 58; friendship and alliance, 15, 18, 26; claims Coele Syria, 168; joint-reign with Physcon, 69; war with Physcon, 168; receives gifts from R., 75
Ptolemy VII Physcon, clientship, 102, 103, 169; joint-reign with Philometor, 69, 80; receives Libya and Cyrene, 168; war with Philometor, 97, 168; despotic rule, 157; expelled from Egypt, 169; visit to R., 125; bequest of Cyrene to Ptol. Apion, 174
Ptolemy VIII Soter, 169
Ptolemy IX Alexander, 104, 146, 169
Ptolemy X Alexander, 170; set up by Sulla, 77, 137; bequest to R., 145, 146, 148, 170
Ptolemy XI Auletes, clientship, 171; friendship and alliance, 19, 20, 32; enrolled 'friend and ally,' 39 n.; recognition of, 84, 137, 147, 159 n.; contributes money, 133, 135; makes R. executor of will, 59, 123
Ptolemy XII, clientship of, 126, 172; enrolled as 'friend and ally,' 39 n.; friendship with Pompey, 140
Ptolemy, K. of Mauretania, friend and ally, 30, 60; joint-reign with his father, 69
Pydna, battle of, 6, 46, 98, 153

Quinarius, 122

Rabirius Postumus, C., 119
Recognition, 57–88, 156; formalities of, 71–74; methods of, 21, 58–60, 71; necessity of,

61–71; refused, 82–89; results of, 76–88, 140; secured before accession, 59; significance of, 57, 58; policy of Augustus, 86, 87
Regia auxilia, 122, 144
Regii agri, 148–150
Regulus, distinguished from 'rex,' 76, 141, 216
Res repetundae, 115, 116
Restoration of kings, 18, 85, 87, 130
Rex, title, bestowed or confirmed, 61–65, 68; forfeited or retained after conquest, 141, 142; respect for, 87, 141, 142; sale of, 137, 138; among the Jews, 33, 134; distinguished from 'regulus,' 76, 141; *r. appellatus*, 11, 22 n., 39, 60, 68, 71, 73, 138 n.; *r. externus*, 32, 210
Rhodes, treaty with, 12, 41, 67; helped by Hiero, 90, 165; by Eumenes, 92, 188; clientship, 197 n.
Roles, friend and ally of R., 39 n.
Romanization of kingdoms, 122, 151
Rullus, agrarian law of, 84, 85, 137, 148

Sabinus, 86
Sarmatae, King of, 13
Scaurus, M., 136
Scipio, L. Corn., 52, 186
Scipio, P. Corn., Maior, agreement with Edeco, 16; with Masinissa, 38, 60, 108; overtures to Prusias I, 111; remonstrates against interference with Carthaginian politics, 119
Scipio, P. Corn., Minor, agreement with Gulussa, 36; action in Numidia, 69, 105, 175, 178; receives presents, 139; summons aid from kings, 106, 135; commission of, 102, 169
Scribonius, usurper in Bosporus, 211
Seleucus IV, K. of Syria, position of, 52, 53, 191; clientship of, 4, 191
Selge, quarrel with Eumenes, 188; attacked by Attalus II, 189
Sergius, M., commission of, 101
Sittius Nucerinus, P., 181
Sociae cohortes, 122
Societas, 10–48; *s. paterna*, 25; *and see* Friendship
Socius, meaning of term, 10–48, 110; enrolment as, 34, 39–44, 73 n.; title as reward, 34, 35
Socius atque amicus, 10–48, 65; title of honour or reward, 19, 26, 30, 34–38, 43, 47, 60; expressing clientship, 44–48
Sophene, 203, 204, 218
Sophonisba, 177
Stater, 121
Stipendiarius, 127 n., 128
Subject population of kingdoms, *see* Kingdoms
Succession, settlement of, 59, 77–80, 123, 143; family rights of, 79, 84, 85, 87; by rule of primogeniture, 61, 71, 79–81; rival claimants, 81, 82; policy of Augustus, 86
Sulla, L., action in Cappadocia, 112, 140, 204; in Egypt, 77, 137, 147, 155 n., 170; in Paphlagonia, 99; seeks aid from Egypt, 104; overtures to Bocchus, 7, 152
Sulpicius, C., commission of, 101
Συμμαχέω, 38
Syllaeus, 97
Syphax, K. of Massaesylii, friendship with R., 25, 38; friendship and alliance, 26, 36; receives gifts, 76

Τὰ φιλάνθρωπα, 13 n., 15, 60 n.
Tarcondimotus, tetrarch of Cilicia, 18
Tarquinius, treaty of, with Latins, 66

Taxation of kingdoms, 129, 130, 132; imposed by R., *see* Tribute
Teuta, Queen, pays indemnity, 131 n.
Thisbae, treaty with, 56
Tiberius, Emperor, 88, 141
Tigranes, K. of Armenia, annexes Syria, 195; attacks Cappadocia, 204; treaty and position of, 53, 54, 74; clientship of, 7, 145, 218, 219; friendship and alliance, 18, 37, 38, 39 n.; called 'king of kings,' 70, 73, 142
Tigranes (son of preceding), 53
Tigranes, son of Artavasdes, K. of Armenia, 141
Timarchus, rival of Demetrius I, 194
Toga picta, 75; *t. praetexta*, 75, 76, 216; *t. purpurea*, 75, 216
Togatorum formula, 40
Traders, 56, 144, 158
Treaty, *see Foedus*; limitations of the term, 66 n.
Tribal chiefs, 133, 134
Tribute (regular), 127–135; in Judaea, 222, 224, 224 n.; irregular contributions, 36, 51, 132, 133, 135–137; presents to generals, 138, 139; *see also* Indemnity
Triumvirs, influence of, 29, 55, 84, 118, 138, 142
Tryphon, Diodotus, usurps Syrian throne, 195; refused recognition, 60, 139, 195

Ususfructus, 113, 117, 128

Vatinius, P., 137
Vectigales, 127 n.
Vermina, son of Syphax, 26
Verres, C., 21
Viriathus, treaty with, 13 n., 37
Visits of kings to Rome, 124, 125
Vitellius, Emperor, 129
Vocio, king of Norici, 110
Vonones, king of Parthia, 69, 142

War, right of, 50, 51, 59, 91–100; in Europe, 94, 99; against rebels, 91–93; on frontiers, 94, 95; assistance in, 11, 103–110; assistance voluntary, 107–110; contributions of kings, 107–110, 135–137; Roman support for kings, 45, 97, 111–112; rewards to kings for co-operation, 112, 113; declaration of war upon client kings, 160, 161; war-elephants, 50–52, 110; war-ships, 50–52
Wills, 122–124; ratified by senate, 123; senate as executor, 59, 123; ratified by emperor, 86, 87, 123, 124; genuineness of, 146, 147

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Date Due

10728

STORAGE 937
S25

PELLETIER LIBRARY, ALLEGHENY COLLEGE
3 3768 00588 0490